

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

WE earnestly hope that the course of events in the Far East will permit the holding of the projected meeting of the International Missionary Council next year in Hangchow. If, as we trust, it does meet, it will be a singularly interesting, impressive, and challenging assemblage; for the delegates sent from Asia and Africa will slightly outnumber those from Europe and America. It reminds us forcibly that the world is one as never before, and that Christianity is a world-religion as never before.

The questions which are being studied with a view to the meeting are big questions about the Faith and the Church in action. Principal J. S. WHALE was asked to write something which might be informative and stimulative of interest in next year's proceedings. The learned Principal disclaims very modestly any special equipment which would enable him to speak on the Church in Asia; but he is rightly persuaded that, however different externals may be in Asia, in India, or China, the Church in every land is faced with fundamentally the same task.

So he has set down some very important considerations in a little book which is entitled *What is a Living Church?* (Edinburgh House Press; 1s. net). That, it seems to us, was the big question to which all the discussions at Edinburgh this autumn pointed. And that is the question of which all the proposed agenda for Hangchow present different aspects.

What, then, is a living Church? According to Principal WHALE it is revealed to the world and stands forth by its faith, its worship, its witness, and its action.

'Living Christianity is what it has ever been, a believing Christianity.' 'The New Testament is never wistful; it rings with a note of solemn joyous certainty.' 'Conviction is the presupposition and *raison d'être* of the Gospel.' And first and last Christian belief is belief in the living God who has revealed Himself to man. Then there is belief about sin. Then belief in Jesus Christ our Lord, this last being 'the vital heart of our faith.' Then there is belief in the Church catholic and evangelical as 'the sacred gift of God—a wonderful and sacred mystery, the great company of the elect of God stretching beyond the sight of any man across the centuries and the continents.'

In face of the doubts expressed as to this faith it is argued that the Christian faith is rational, realist, and redemptive. No Barthian need shudder at 'rational' as Dr. WHALE uses the term. He means merely that the Christian faith answers in a way which nowise offends reason—the questions which a serious reasonable man is compelled to raise. By 'realism' he means that the Christian religion deals with man as he really is, not sentimentalized; it deals honestly and fairly with sin and man's inability to help himself. It opposes the optimistic humanism which came to its climax in the Great War. Against the ideology of Fascism or Communism, Christianity, like every living religion, holds up redemption, and believes it knows the secret in 'the Word of God coming from eternity into time and in terms of time, in judgment and sovereign grace.'

Let us pass to the searching sections on witnessing. 'Vital Christianity,' says Dr. WHALE, 'is necessarily

a witnessing Christianity.' 'Real religion is always enthusiastic and propagandist.' 'Our faith is not safe, nor is it real faith, unless we find it so precious that we cannot keep it to ourselves, and unless we realize that religious individualism is a contradiction in terms.' 'The religion which a man cherished in his bosom and kept to himself would not be religion but religiosity, and even religious fellowship which he enjoyed with a coterie of like-minded friends—carefully selected people of his own class or culture—would not be religious fellowship but mere gregariousness. He only begins to understand the Gospel when he understands that it is God's Good News for all sorts and conditions of men, and cries, Woe is me if I do not preach it. Unless we are ambassadors for the faith we are not holding the faith.'

We have to witness to ourselves, to children, and to the great multitude everywhere which is largely pagan. The call to witness begins at home. If our witness to the world is to be effectual and convincing we must look first and last and all the time to ourselves. A renewal of vital religion in the world must begin among professed Christians. What is the way of renewal?—Prayer. Multitudes in our time have ceased to pray, and when praying ends, paganism and practical materialism begin. The deadliest enemy of religion is not doctrinaire atheism in Russia, but the practical atheism nearer home which 'neither denies nor affirms, but just ignores.'

The religious inner life of the Church depends on the religious life of the home, and *vice versâ*. 'If there is no regular and real prayer in private and in the family, if our homes are not places where prayer is wont to be made; if there is no private and diligent study of the Bible whereby men search the Scriptures and find in them the fount of divine wisdom—little wonder that many a church service seems weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable, and that no effective progress is made in the ordinary Christian group to grow in the knowledge of the living God. Public worship thus degenerates into the likeness of a public meeting (without its possible liveliness) and the result is dreariness and spiritual death.'

It is interesting to find Dr. WHALE strongly disposed to recommend the formations of *ecclesiolas in ecclesiis*—the experiment of small or large groups within the congregation that would meet for prayer and the study of the Word. 'Their life together in the intimacy of prayer and consecration would be a vicarious priesthood, convincing others, subduing them to the same contrition, and drawing them into the same fellowship of renewal.'

Dean Albert C. KNUDSON, of Boston University School of Theology, is not so well known on this side of the Atlantic as he ought to be. His books are a credit to the theological scholarship of American Methodism, and are to be commended for the clearness of their expositions and the soundness of their judgments. They furnish notable contributions not only in the field of Old Testament Theology, but also in that of Systematic Doctrine. Nor has the philosophical basis of theology been neglected by him. He has now followed up his defence of personalistic theism with an able plea for *The Validity of Religious Experience* (Abingdon Press; \$2.00).

It is a timely work, and has been written in full view of recent discussions in America and Britain. The only criticism of it we would offer is that it does not appear to move so freely and independently among contemporary writings in this field as one might have expected. Dr. KNUDSON is so experienced a writer and has established so secure a place for himself in the theological world that he might safely have paid less homage to other writers than himself.

A discussion of the nature of religious experience leads to the main part of the work, in which are examined the various grounds for believing in the truth or validity of religious experience. To this question there are three chief answers. One emphasizes the immediacy of religious experience, another its value, and another its principle of self-verification. These three answers are subjected to a careful examination, and the conclusion is stated

that the ultimate basis for belief in religious experience as valid is to be found, not in its immediacy, nor in its practical utility, but in the native religious endowment of the human spirit. It is argued that religion is structural in the human mind, and as such has logically as valid a basis as has philosophy, or morality, or art. Like those other phases of experience it verifies itself, and no profounder validation is possible.

For the exposition of these views reference must be made to the pages of the work itself. We would now draw attention to the last of its five chapters, which deals with the specific Christian experience, as distinguished from religious experience in general. Here the same appeal is made to man's religious nature. Like other religions Christianity is validated by the common religious reason. The Christian type of experience professes to be no more than the purest and most highly developed form of religious experience. 'Christ would mean nothing to us unless there were already within us a native yearning after the divine.'

We shall not pause to indicate in detail how obnoxious such doctrine is to the Barthian theology. We go on to say that Dr. KNUDSON prefaces his treatment of the most significant elements of Christian experience with a reference to its uniqueness. A deep consciousness of sin, a profound belief in the divine grace, and a strong spirit of hope appear in other religions of the 'prophetic' type (as distinct from the 'mystical'), but in Christianity they have received a unique development, and they are basic to the framework of the Christian life.

But the most distinctive element in the unique Christian experience is the experient's sense of personal relationship to Christ. The mystical consciousness of being united to Christ in a direct personal relation is involved even in the sense of the Divine Presence. God comes to the Christian as the God and Father of the Lord Jesus Christ. Christ and Deity are for the Christian indissolubly linked together. God is for the Christian a Christ-like God. And the profoundest Christian thought

of Christ is that God was in Him reconciling the world unto Himself.

That God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself is indeed a presupposition of Christian experience. If less than this were affirmed with reference to Christ, Christian experience would lose its distinctive character. But how to conceive of the presence of God in Christ is one of the most perplexing questions that have engaged the attention of Christian thinkers. It should be observed, however, that Christian experience is not concerned with the mode of the Divine immanence or the method of the reconciliation. All that Christian experience is concerned with is the fact of Christ, the fact of His unique relation to God, the fact of His reconciling activity.

'If God was actually in Him reconciling the world unto Himself, we need nothing more. That is sufficient ground for assigning to Him the position of Divine leadership which He has occupied in Christian experience from the beginning.'

Dr. Lynn Harold HUGH includes in his book of essays—*The Civilized Mind*—one on 'The Message of Colossians,' which is a quite brilliant piece of exposition. He compares Paul, immured in his prison in Rome, with Sir Walter Raleigh, who, during his twelve years of confinement in the Tower of London, wrote his famous 'History of the World.' Both were daring men of action, hungering for commanding achievement in the world. Both had a large capacity for brooding thought, and to both prison brought an opportunity for the high adventures of the mind which would scarcely have been found in any other way.

Paul's experience of travel and contact with men in the Roman Empire had affected his mind profoundly. He was constantly receiving benefits from the Pax Romana. And more and more this vast organization of the life of civilized man impressed him as something beneficent. Roman engineering, Roman law, and the Roman spirit evidenced the strength, vigour, and vast serviceable-

ness of the imperial régime. And so his thought tended to become more and more imperial. If a human institution could be made so potent a force for good, what might not the Christian religion achieve for bringing unity and coherence to the life of man.

And it was the busy life of men, their keen and turbulent thoughts, their moral battles and spiritual possibilities which most stirred Paul. Unlike Wordsworth, he was not aroused to spiritual understanding by the lonely silences of Nature. He was more interested in people than in things. No impulse from the vernal wood had anything to say to him about moral evil or good. And therefore it was in a city like Rome that he felt himself most profoundly moved. His thoughts were stirred to vividness and imaginative splendour when he felt the throb of life in the world's metropolis around him. The enforced quiet of his prison life only emancipated his mind and gave his imagination wings.

At the time at which Paul arrived in Rome things were altering for the worse. Nero's five benignant years of rule were giving way to the period of wild and cruel ferocity. Paul had confidently expected justice in the court of the Emperor, but that dream was rudely dispelled, and he was forced back on the sources of comfort and courage in his own faith. At the same time he received word from Epaphras of the quaint heresies that were invading the Colossian Church, heresies which, above all, were a lowering of the dignity and saving power of Christ, and the substitution of various intermediaries.

It was under this double stimulus that there came to him that wonderful conception of the 'Cosmic Christ.' In Him all things were created. In Him 'we must seek for the ultimate meaning of the world.' He is all and in all, everything and in everything. This is the highest flight of Paul's imperial vision. It is clear that he could never regard the religions of the world as on one level, each with some contribution to make to the final religion which is a synthesis of them all. He was certain that the Christian religion was not an aspect of

man's quest for God, but was God's quest for men, God in action in Jesus Christ for the remaking of human life. This was the deep source of Paul's life.

His message in Colossians is that Christ is the very secret of the life of the universe. And the Church of twenty centuries is especially with Paul at this point. If the Christian Church should ever forget that in Christ God comes into human life as He comes in no other person, in no other place, in no other way, the day of creative power for the Christian religion would come to an end. So Paul believed, and this is the heart of what he was saying to the Colossians.

It is essentially characteristic of this Epistle that all its practical suggestions about personal and family and social virtue are deeply related to Paul's vision of the finality of Christ. His spirit is to control all the activities of men, as it masters the world of creation and the vast and impalpable regions beyond. The vision of His universal significance is to change men's attitude towards all processes of thought and all human relationships. The vision of the cosmic significance of Christ which transfigured a prisoner's life for Paul was to transform the thought and life of Christian men everywhere.

This, then, is the message of the Epistle to the Colossians. Only a transcendent Christ can meet the need of this strange creature, man. There are, as we have seen, strands in this cord of faith. It is better to say there were currents of influence leading Paul inevitably towards this faith. His sensitiveness to the imperial idea, the sufferings that threw him back on himself and made him ask what it was on which he leant, and the challenge offered by the weird heresies at Colosse. And the issue in his soul was this dominant claim for his Saviour. It is a tremendous claim, but it is the faith by which the Christian Church lives. Whenever the Church is fully conscious of its high calling it rises to the Alpine heights where everything else becomes insignificant in the light of the cosmic significance of Christ.

The Basic Forms of Theological Thought.

BY PROFESSOR KARL BARTH, BASEL, SWITZERLAND.

I UNDERSTAND by the forms of theological thought the area, so to speak, within which theological thought moves, the necessity and limitation within which it moves, and also its freedom. The 'basic forms' are those which are valid as necessitating, limiting, and liberating factors in theology universally and without exception, whatever historical and individual differences may exist. The basic forms of theological thought which I would like to survey are therefore what might be called the constitutional principles of theology.

Any one who is a theologian in the narrower sense of the word should possess special clarity with regard to these. Further, all those others who would like to be convinced, responsible, and active members of the Church in other respects, cannot but see how desirable it would be to possess a certain amount of knowledge in this connexion also. Further, there is the man who is accustomed from a distance to frame his own thoughts about the Church and theology either in a friendly or unfriendly spirit and who occasionally gives utterance to these thoughts. Should he not in so doing require himself to run his eye over what theology actually is, and what in essentials may and may not be expected from it? It cannot be said of us theologians ourselves that we always possess such clarity and spread it. Even in circles sincerely and joyfully attached to the Church there are too few who recognize these constitutional principles and who can, for instance, understand a sermon, or participate in a theological discussion, or judge the problems of a Church situation in a worthy and competent manner. And competence, based upon a knowledge of these points, is an even more rare occurrence among those who stand outside the Church.

What is the reason for this? In reply, people often refer to the supposed trade secrets of theology, which every man cannot be expected to know and use. It cannot be disputed that in theology as in all paths of life there is a definite technique which as such can as a rule only be the concern of theologians in the narrower sense of the word. It is not with this technique, however, that we are here concerned, but with the knowledge of the basic forms which belong as properly to theological thought as do, for instance, their equivalents to technical, commercial, educational, athletic, and

political thought. Let me draw your attention now to a fact which is surely remarkable. People feel it at least a defect and a regrettable lack that they have to admit that in so many spheres they are strangers to the very presuppositions which are there perfectly clear. In theology, on the other hand, people have no hesitation in confessing almost with emphasis their lack of understanding of the very fundamental principles, and they justify themselves by that reference to theological technique which, as we have seen, will not bear closer inspection. To this extent they confess to an utterly miserable dilettantism. It is remarkable also that the oft-cited lack of unity among theologians themselves plays so important a part in the imagination of widely spread circles. Many people seem almost to take a pleasure in proving the existence of this disunity and likewise in assigning it as the reason why men decide to save themselves the trouble of examining even the fundamental principles in theology, or of taking up a definite position towards them. But this is what is required unconditionally in other spheres, where peace does not exist any more than in theology, and it is required all the more, the more important these spheres are for life. And this is the case even when men confess that the competence with which they do so leaves much to be desired. Why is this not expected also in theology? What is the reason that precisely in regard to theology there is so much satisfaction, or at least supposed satisfaction, with catchwords which lie fatally ready to hand and with conceptions which are only too obscure? Perhaps I may be permitted to leave this question to the close, so that I may first give some account of the subject itself.

Theological thought, like all orderly human thought, receives its basic forms from its object. It is by its object that it is first and foremost awakened and rendered possible: by it, it is claimed, employed, and requisitioned; by it, given form and order and stamped as theological thought. It is therefore thought which, possessed of all freedom—otherwise it would not be thought—is not accidental or arbitrary but determined and limited from without; that is, it is thought determined and limited by its object. It can be none the less very varied thought as it is conditioned in one way or another by the various ages with their particular destinies, problems, and presuppositions, and, above all, by

the infinite variety of human individuality. Thus it is secured from ever being a uniform type of thought. It is more important, however, to consider the other fact, that it is never on that account abandoned to the spirit of the various ages, or to the disposal of the individual, but beyond these, its alterable conditions, it is subject to another unalterable order. Theology cannot let any final pronouncement be made to it by these its alterable conditions; it cannot permit its basic forms to be given it from that source. To the extent in which it would do this, it would inevitably become bad theology. And if it became incapable of resisting these alterable conditions, and if it really and finally evaded the limitations and restraints imposed upon it by its object, it would thereby inevitably cease to be theology. The unalterable order to which it is subject is the order imposed by its object. In all this, theological thought differs in nothing from all other orderly human thought. Much would have been achieved if every one had recognized as obvious that theological thought, just like medical or military or artistic thought, possesses an objectivity which is imposed upon it. In spite of all incidental movement within its bounds, it cannot depart from this objectivity, if it is to avoid becoming bad theology, and if it is not to surrender itself totally.

We come now to the object of theological thought from which it receives its basic forms. It is at this point that it has to go its own way. Its object is the reality on which the Christian Church is founded, the reality which forms the content of its life and the substance of its message. Its object is the man Jesus Christ present here to-day, as He was yesterday, through the Holy Spirit in the witness of the Old and New Testaments. It is God Himself in His truth, that is in His revelation—the God who reveals and judges man's sin, takes it upon Himself and forgives it, the God who gives man the hope of eternal life and in doing so takes man into His service. Such is the object by which theological thought has been awakened and rendered possible, the stamp of which it must bear in all circumstances. Theological thought is the thought of the Church; it is the thought which the Church must continually occupy itself with; it is its origin and essence. Everything else, whether it be the method of theological thought, its language, or the piety bound up with it, has from the beginning changed and will change again. But there must not be a single iota of change in the impression stamped on it by its object Jesus Christ, the Word of God, as He is witnessed to in the Bible, and in this sense not an iota of change in the attachment of theology to

the Church. It is only a bad theology, one which is degenerating into a lack of theology, which would want to change anything here. You may deny the reality of theology, but you cannot demand from it that, in this fundamental relationship to its object, it should be anything else than that which it alone can be. And it is impossible to understand why theology should not make this state of affairs clear in a way which limits it much more closely, or why it should not confess to this relationship much more frankly than it has generally done in recent times—and that neglect has not been for its salvation.

Jesus Christ, the object of theological thought, is a historical reality—indeed, a historical reality witnessed to in definite documents, those of the Bible. In the same Gospel in which it is written that the Word became flesh, He has called Himself the Way. Therefore theological thought must not stray across country but keep to the way. It must assume the form of Biblical exposition. It has no choice in the matter because it is determined and limited by its historical, and historically attested, object. It cannot free itself from history and construct itself from its own resources. Equally it cannot be free thought and occupy itself with some other piece of history. Equally too, as it occupies itself with this particular piece of history, it cannot maintain its hold on any other documents. As theological thought it can only be exposition of the Bible. It may be instructed by Church History only because, and so far as, the latter is the history of previous Biblical exposition—history which is most certainly highly instructive both positively and negatively. The task of Biblical exposition consists in making heard the witness to Jesus Christ, once uttered and written down as such, and in making it heard to-day as a voice speaking from that time. In this form theological thought distinguishes itself from empty conceptual thought, from the speculations of all self-elected and self-righteous types of piety, and from the arbitrary gnosis of so-called *Weltanschauungen*. In this form it is always fresh, original, fruitful, animated, and animating. In this form it serves the Church, and through the Church the World. The Church lives by the remembrance of that time when it came into being. It is that time which directs and corrects her, which leads and preserves her, and which for that very reason wishes ever anew to be expressed. If theology becomes untrue, even for a moment, to that time, if it preaches a 'to-day' in abstraction from that time, and if it wishes to be more than exposition, it will without any doubt become bad theology.

Jesus Christ, the object of theological thought, is also the truth, and truth means revelation, that is, the authoritative differentiation of the light from the darkness. Theological thought must be therefore, in the second place, a differentiating, that is in Greek, a critical type of thought. It must distinguish between what it has learned from its documents and what the past, and especially the momentary present, has inserted or placed beside it out of its uncontrolled opinion. In the service of its object it must draw distinctions in what the Church of to-day thinks to be her message, distinguishing what pertains to this its object from what is foreign to it, and therefore distinguishing the divine majesty from the pseudo-majesties, well meant and less well meant, which seek to thrust themselves into the place of the former; and therefore it must separate truth from error and falsehood. Because theological thought fixes boundaries and therefore makes contours visible, it is for its time the seeing eye of the Church. It was certainly an unhappy innovation when theology viewed from this point of view began to be called systematic theology. Attempts at systematizing in the realm of theology have always been attempts to unite truth with error. Our task here is precisely the prevention of such attempts. The old name, controversial theology, was certainly more appropriate for the service of watchman which theology has to perform. For it actually has this controversial side. If this second form of theological thought were intentionally overlooked, the task of Biblical interpretation could well be misunderstood as a mere stocktaking of far-off bygone things. The place where a testimony to God's revelation ought to be expounded might be occupied by a purely historical treatment of the Bible and of Church History. This historical treatment might seem suspiciously poor in its collocation of undigested facts, and also suspiciously rich in its pompous parade as a history of the human mind. In both cases it gives rise to empty views.

The attitude of such historical treatment is one of neutrality to the question of truth, towards which revelation itself forbids us to take up an attitude of neutrality. When theological thought in its first form as exposition falls victim to such a disease, it is certainly not the fault of the real Bible or of real Church History. And let us not forget the other point either that theological thought in its second, that is, critical form would also have lost its character at once, if in this form it had sought to make itself independent; that is, if it had sought openly or secretly to obtain its criterion in any other way than through exposition of the Bible.

Jesus Christ is the life, that is to say, the actual salvation of the man who believes in Him. Therefore He forces theology, which is determined and limited by Him, inevitably to go beyond exposition and criticism and become proclamation. For this reason the ancients named the whole of theology *doctrina*, 'teaching.' By that they meant (in contrast to a later corrupt use of the word) precisely this, that theological thinking is a practical type of thinking, a type of thinking which applies to man and his real life, and may be therefore no merely contemplative abstract form of meditation. It is no thinking for thinking's sake, but thinking for the sake of responsibility, proclamation, confession, witness, consolation, and exhortation. The Church, whose thinking it is now, becomes visible as the community of believers who may and must hear ever and again that they are a community not lost but possessing eternal life. And the world now becomes visible as the world which in its confusion, perplexity, and subjection to death waits for the Word of God—for the Word that illuminates, points away and is full of hope. The thought of the theological critic and exegete must be of this kind as must the thought of those who, though not professionally theologians, are yet competent and willing to join in the work. Theological thought will always direct itself at first toward the thinker himself, but also secondly and immediately it will direct itself further towards one's neighbour. In this, the practical point of theology, it aims at faith, it inquires about faith, it invites men to have faith, it prays the Holy Spirit for true faith in the midst of that 'fellowship of saints' which is so called only because it is a fellowship in this petition. Thought which lacks this climax would from the very start fail to be theological thought. It is impossible to have exposition for the sake of exposition—an *explicatio* which from the very beginning does not compel an *applicatio*. Equally impossible here is criticism for the sake of criticism, criticism which would seek to deny for some other reason than for the sake of the unshaken affirmation which remains unimpaired. If exposition and criticism are sick—there are so many theological diseases—then they can and must become well again through the recollection of this their concrete task. The converse of this, however, ought not to be forgotten here. The practical point of theological thinking is clear-cut only where it is nourished and yet corrected by hard and serious endeavour after exposition and by a bitter struggle for the truth, as these two stand behind it in all their actuality. It trickles away in the sand, it can become rabid or dead or dangerous—this alleged Christian proclamation—where this background of

patient inquiry into the text and indefatigable distinguishing of truth from falsehood is missing.

Let me say a word more about the freedom in which theological thought moves within the sphere of its necessity and limitation. The symmetry of these three basic forms in which I have presented the matter for the sake of a survey is something which in point of fact probably never occurs, and which indeed is probably never permitted to occur. It is not only permissible but required and in order, that theological thought in certain ages and individuals should take on more visibly and emphatically the character of exposition in order to accomplish certain tasks within the Church. In other ages and individuals it takes on the character of criticism, and in others that of proclamation. Theological thought possesses this freedom that it is permitted also to be one-sided. But this permission must not be without compulsion. Every case of one-sidedness must come into operation not as personal whim or desire, but as a gift and a commission. Therefore this freedom, too, must be in reality the royal freedom of the Word of God, and not one of the paltry attempts at freedom that man allows himself. The varieties of theological thought which rise out of this freedom must not be confused with the mutually exclusive antitheses between good theology and bad theology, or between theology and the lack of theology. For a variety based on obedience creates a richness which it is to be hoped the Church will not deplore but feel grateful for. Certainly people have often spoken of this richness where it was out of place to do so and where a struggle would have been better and more full of love than peace. A freedom to practise bad, that is, unbiblical, uncritical, or unpractical theology, or indeed freedom to practise something that is not theology at all, is out of the question in any intelligible sense of the term freedom. With what real right could this be seriously demanded? Or should the freedom to be unobjective, so properly refused in every other sphere of thought, exist in theology? Theology becomes bad or fails to be theology where the determining and limiting power of its object is forgotten or denied. Free speculation or a merely historical treatment stalk about as the one-sidedness permitted and required, and with them goes idle talk, arbitrary and foreign to the Church's task. Behind them all stands human caprice. In all these cases no one ought to marvel or be shocked, if there can be no peace there but rather warning and protest and, if necessary, strife. And whoever calls attention to the fact that the fellowship of the Church is endangered by all this should

not be suspected as a disturber of the peace. Inside the freedom of theological thought the fellowship of the Church must be upheld whatever the price; outside this freedom it cannot be upheld at all. It is once more the object of theological thought itself which places it under this double law of freedom.

I promised at the beginning that at the close I would return to the question why it can happen that theological thought even among the theologians themselves is such a relatively rare thing. After what I have said, might I perhaps ask you if you are still of the opinion that, in trying to understand this type of thought, we are dealing with abnormally difficult problems, and if, finally, it has not become clear to you that the oft-cited strife among theologians themselves is significant and necessary, and that therefore it can be no reason for not co-operating in this type of thought? No, the really serious reason for not participating here, and therefore for remaining a mere dilettante in theologicis, lies in quite another direction and is quite well known to any one who has himself already tried to think theologically. It is, in fact, not so simple a matter to have anything to do with that decisive object of theological thought, to say nothing of letting oneself be influenced and led by it to however small an extent. The matter at stake here is lordship, complete obedience, life and death, the crossing of a Rubicon. For it is a matter of faith when we are dealing with Jesus Christ. Not every one can and may cross this Rubicon. No one—as the Bible makes sufficiently clear—can do so in his own strength. So, to be sure, there is a secret behind theology, only it is not a trifling trade secret but simply the secret of human life, of our life over which none of us has any power. But let it be clearly understood, this secret is an open secret, and no decree which has been concluded and promulgated somewhere in the heights darkly above our heads. In the midst of this secret new decisions are made to-day and will be made to-morrow. The first can become last and the last first. The wise can reveal themselves as ignorant, and the ignorant can become wise. The history of theology is a witness to this. Whether we count ourselves among the few who understand, or among the many who do not understand, we will not go wrong if we consider theological thinking as an offer, in regard to which the decision which will be made to-morrow remains open to-day. If no one in the light of his own strength is capable of thinking theologically, none the less it may be said in the light of the object of theological thought that verily no one must remain excluded from it.

The Best Books on Missions.

By PROFESSOR GODFREY E. PHILLIPS, M.A., SELLY OAK COLLEGES, BIRMINGHAM.

THE difficulty of selection felt throughout the articles in this series is enhanced in this case by the difficulty in defining the limits of the subject. Books not specifically intended for missionaries may nevertheless provide them with their best tools. For example, in the vital matter of 'The Message' some think no better help has been given in recent years than by the opening chapters of E. Brunner's *The Mediator* (Eng. tr., 1934), especially the first on 'The Distinction between General and Special Revelation.' In the same connexion C. H. Dodd's *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments* (1936) shows from the New Testament how there can be bold restatement of the original gospel which does not depart from its original meaning, while Principal Micklem's *What is the Faith?* (1936) should wake up by its sharp challenge any whose preaching has been drifting into the vagueness caused by insufficient attention to the history of revelation. It was never more necessary than in these days that the missionary trumpet should have no uncertain sound.

In the same way books which tell the story of the expanding Christian Church throughout the centuries serve the modern missionary. T. R. Glover's *Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire* (1909) is full of indirect guidance and inspiration. So is Harnack's *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries* (Eng. tr., 1908). Fortunately there is more writing of Church History than formerly which has in mind the Church in the areas where modern missions work. For instance, H. Pakenham-Walsh's *Lights and Shades of Christendom to A.D. 1000* (1936) is written by a missionary churchman with lifelong experience of India. On the relation between Christianity and other religions we get guidance from the writers on Comparative Religion and the Philosophy of Religion. Here we owe a special debt to the late Archbishop Nathan Söderblom of Sweden, two of whose books have been translated into English, a short but weighty one on *The Nature of Revelation* (1933) and the fuller book, *The Living God* (1933), which sets our religion of an historical revelation in its true context of the religious life of the whole world. Dr. Cave on a smaller scale did the same thing in *Christianity and Some Living Religions of the East* (1929).

The Anthropologists open doors for missionaries

into the minds of primitive people; a notable example is Dr. R. R. Marett's *The Threshold of Religion*² (1914) and his *Faith, Hope, and Charity in Primitive Religion* (1932).

When we come to books more directly on missions, at the outset we are confronted with the unhappy division between Roman Catholics and the rest of us which we regret, but which it is impossible to ignore, more impossible abroad even than at home, for there has been a notable recent advance in Roman Catholic missionary effort which has involved invasion of many Protestant spheres. In the science of missions we have much to learn from the Romans, for they have many centuries of experience as against our one and a half. We have no Bibliography to compare with their *Bibliotheca Missionum* begun by P. R. Streit in 1916 and continued till now by P. J. Dindinger. Here already are eight massive volumes each about a thousand pages, setting out with brief descriptions the literature available on Catholic Missions. The last volume, on literature of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries connected with India and Indonesia, with its 1028 pages is an impressive illustration of the difficulty of selection from material so vast. The text is in German, but naturally the books dealt with are in many tongues. In this article we refer only to two general works on Catholic missions, a useful *Atlas of Catholic Missions* published in German in 1932 with 49 maps—students of missions should never work without maps—and a general work on *Catholic Mission Theory*, by J. Schmidlin (Eng. tr., 1931). It is in the study of the theory of missions that Catholics and non-Catholics have most in common, and on the whole Schmidlin's references to Protestant work are fair-minded. Many Protestants would find a useful intellectual discipline in the reading of such a book as this.

We Protestants, when we need a clear and comprehensive setting out of the theory, doctrine, and fundamental principles of missions, have still nothing in English at all comparable to the monumental three-volume work of Gustav Warneck, *Evangelische Missionslehre*³ (1902), which first placed the study of missions firmly among the theological disciplines, and so based practice upon sound theory as to justify the use of the term 'Science of Missions.' The world has changed since this book was written, but its principles are still

so relevant that any missionary turning over its pages will find guidance for to-day.

Alike in statement of theory and in broad presentation of history, our German colleagues have, as was to be expected, done more than British or Americans. English writers have on the whole done better work in description, presentation of particular situations, study of technique and guidance as to the next practical steps to be taken. The great historian of the missionary enterprise is Julius Richter, whose *History of Missions in India* (1908) and *History of Protestant Missions in the Near East* (1910) are fortunately available in English. His *History of Evangelical Missions in Africa* (1922) is only in German. By the way, Julius Richter on his seventieth birthday in 1932 was presented with a volume of essays written by fifteen of the best known leaders of German missions under the title *Botschafter an Christi Statt* ('Ambassadors on Behalf of Christ'), which makes a convenient introduction to German missionary thought of the present. For historical study British and American missionaries have usually to refer to the standard histories of their own societies. Some of these are both indispensable and excellent, but they are inevitably sectional; there is scope for more books of Richter's type, surveying large fields as a unity, to be written by Britons or Americans on the history of missions. Missionaries to China are fortunate in having K. S. Latourette's fine *History of Christian Missions in China* (1929).

A whole range of attractive missionary literature designed to educate people of various age-grades in the facts about modern missions has been prepared during our time by the United Council for Missionary Education, representing one of the best bits of inter-church co-operation in our day. Only a few of its outstanding books can be mentioned in this article, but any one can make the acquaintance of the rest through the Bookrooms of the missionary societies. In scientific and practical propaganda of the right kind, work has been done of which British missions are justly proud.

Practical works of reference have been made available through the International Missionary Council, notably the *Directory of Foreign Missions* (1933) which gives particulars, with statistics, of Missionary Societies, Colleges, Co-operative Councils, and other Agencies of the Protestant Churches throughout the world, and the *World Missionary Atlas* (1925), containing maps which show all mission stations.

The Edinburgh Conference of 1910 seems far behind us now, but comprehensive reviewing of the

missionary movement began there, so much of its report still has value to a reader who can discriminate, as is not difficult, between the temporary and the permanent. That is yet more true of the eight-volume report of the Jerusalem Meeting of the International Missionary Council (1928), and next year there is to be another world conference. A good way of getting to grips with any major subject connected with modern missions would be to see what was said about it at Edinburgh and Jerusalem, to follow the directions there given to other sources of information, and to read the relevant articles in the quarterly *International Review of Missions* which keeps discussion up to date. Alongside of the more representative statements it is useful to study the American laymen's review of a century of missionary progress in *Rethinking Missions* (1932), which, although most of us consider it over-influenced by left-wing theology, is well worth reading. For the research student there is a mine of information in the seven volumes of facts, published in 1933, upon which the laymen's opinions had been formed.

Two other general storehouses of information must be mentioned. The whole series of 'World Call' books issued by the Missionary Council of the Anglican Churches, while rightly having Anglican missions mainly in view, has set a good example in its references to other missions and its presentation of the situation in its areas as a whole—see, for instance, *The Call from the Moslem World* (1926). And the World Dominion Press has produced surveys of different parts of the world, crammed with facts gathered with industry and skill, showing the magnitude of the land still to be occupied. There is a poignant interest in its volume by C. A. Garcia and K. G. Grubb, with wonderful maps, diagrams, and illustrations, issued only in 1933, on *Religion in the Republic of Spain*.

Those who simply want a broad outline survey of the missionary enterprise in the changes through which it is passing in our own time can find it in *Missions To-morrow* (1936) by K. S. Latourette of Yale University. They will find a special interest in the masterly closing chapter on the programme of missions in the new day.

What may be called the case for missions has always to be restated, but I doubt whether it can be done much better for our generation than in *A Faith for the World* (1929) by W. Paton, who has now brought it up to date by his *Christianity in the Eastern Conflicts* (1936), written after a journey through Japan, Manchuria and China, India and the Near East. On the terrifying subject of race we have J. H. Oldham's classical *Christianity and*

the Race Problem (1924), as well as the more popular best-seller B. Mathews' *Clash of Colour* (1924).

On the Biblical foundation of missions, the argument of R. F. Horton's *The Bible a Missionary Book* (1904) is still valid. A new and fascinating study of the New Testament in relation to missionary motive is E. Shillito's *The Way of the Witnesses* (1936). A book which deserves to be more widely known is H. A. Lapham's *The Bible as a Missionary Handbook* (1925), written by a Ceylon missionary who found in the Bible not only the motive for missions but much guidance on missionary method.

Missionary candidates or missionaries who may read this article will be impatient for books relating to their particular field, but it is here that the limitations of space press most severely. We can only mention a few of the greatest books on China, India, and Africa.

CHINA.—The best introduction to the whole subject is K. S. Latourette's *The Chinese, Their History and Culture* (1934). On the religions there is the reliable *Three Religions of China*, by W. E. Soothill (1924), and *Chinese Religious Ideas*, by P. J. MacLagan (1926); and on the history, besides the work mentioned earlier, there is A. C. Moule's attractive *Christians in China before the Year 1550* (1930). A small book packed with accurate 'background' information is W. G. Sewell's *Land and Life of China*.

Chinese Realities, by J. Foster (1928), written out of the heart of a revolutionary situation, threw light on the larger issues affecting modern China in its contacts with the West and with Christianity, and there is the same illuminating quality in his later study of *The Chinese Church in Action* (1933). Three general reports deal with matters of special weight. In 1922 an Educational Commission made a study of the Christian schools and colleges and issued a report *Christian Education in China*, with recommendations for correlating the institutions for advanced education. Like other Eastern countries, China is a land mainly of villages, and it is in them that Christianity has probably its greatest part to play. This lends special importance to the report by an expert in agricultural education, K. L. Butterfield, on *The Rural Mission of the Church in Eastern Asia* (1931). In recent years there has been a deepening of interest in the subject of Religious Education, not merely the maintenance of a few religious institutions, but the nurture in the faith of the whole Christian community, the old and the young, especially the young. In China a deputation of five persons, Chinese and Foreign, after visiting many centres, produced *Religious*

Education in the Chinese Church (1931), which has received attention all over China and in some other countries too. It is commonly known as the Weigle Report, after Dr. L. A. Weigle of Yale Divinity School, who had a large share in producing it.

INDIA.—There is a wealth of books on the history, religions, and literature of the people of India, of which the most important for our subject are those by missionary scholars, notably J. N. Farquhar, whose *Outline of the Religious Literature of India* (1920) is a monument of laborious research and an unfailing source of knowledge. It is well supplemented by the whole series of books under his general editorship with the title *Heritage of India*. The late Professor Rudolf Otto wrote interesting studies of Vaishnavite religion under the titles *Mysticism East and West* (1929) and *India's Religion of Grace* (1930). Those who have time to read only one book would be best advised to read N. Macnicol's *The Living Religions of the Indian People* (1934), written out of the combination of scholarship and a lifetime's experience. The same author gave us in 1930, under the title *India in the Dark Wood*, a clear impression of the spiritual situation among non-Christians and Christians, which has not changed in essentials in the seven years since. A general presentation of what Church and Mission have to do is *The Christian Task in India* (1929) by several leading authorities, edited by J. Mackenzie, the Principal of Wilson College, Bombay. The relation between Government and Christian Missions has special importance in India, and can be best understood from a book by A. Mayhew, who held responsible posts in Government education, *Christianity and the Government of India* (1929). The same author's account of British educational policy in India from 1830–1920, *The Education of India* (1926), makes the best introduction to a study of Education in which Missions have played a prominent part. This should be followed by the reading of *Village Education in India* (1920), the Report of a Commission of Inquiry, which laid down the principles on which most subsequent mission efforts to improve rural schools have been based, and *Christian Higher Education in India* (1931), the Report of a similar Commission presided over by the present Master of Balliol, which has led to much overhauling of the Christian Colleges. To complete the study of education there is now available a survey of the Christian High Schools (1936) by Miss van Doren.

The same student of the rural situation who wrote on the Far East, K. L. Butterfield, after a journey through India produced many valuable suggestions in his *Christian Missions in Rural India* (1930).

How an Indian village lives can be vividly realized from either *Seen and Heard in a Panjab Village*, by M. Young (1931), or *Behind Mud Walls*, by C. V. and W. H. Wiser (1932). The movement towards organic union of the Churches in South India has aroused world-wide interest. A clear and reliable account of it is *Christian Union in South India* (1936), by W. J. Noble.

The whole missionary enterprise is likely to be influenced by the facts about conversion of village groups reported in J. W. Pickett's *Christian Mass Movements in India* (1933), one of the most important books in recent years. A supplementary volume by the same author on the conversion of groups of caste people is probably by this time in the press.

On the presentation of the gospel to Hindus, the most considerable piece of work lately has been E. W. Thompson's *The Word of the Cross to Hindus* (1933), which is scholarly, devout, and practical. More work of this kind is needed to give solid content to the evangelism which happily is now so prominent in Indian missions.

AFRICA.—'Africa is as full of problems as an egg is full of meat.' And during the last fifteen years there has fortunately been a revived interest in these problems and closer co-operation between Governments and Missions in tackling them, resulting in a crop of books dealing with the particular provinces which cannot be mentioned here. Nowhere in the world is the race question so acute, and this lends special importance to a little book *Thinking with Africa* (1928), which includes several Africans among the writers of its chapters, and to the able and authoritative *White and Black in Africa* (1930) in which J. H. Oldham made a critical examination of the Rhodes Lectures by General Smuts.

Of the many general books which set out to reveal the mind of Africa, W. C. Willoughby's *The Soul of the Bantu* (1928), with its sequel *Nature Worship and Taboo* (1932), are specially useful to the missionary; so are the shorter books, *The Golden Stool*, by Edwin Smith (1926) and *The African To-day* (1934), by D. Westermann. Dr. Westermann, who is Director of the International Institute of African Languages and Culture, has just written another book, *Africa and Christianity* (1937), which

according to reviewers is going to be important. Any one desiring to understand the big issues in Africa would do well to secure the special double number of the *International Review of Missions* for July 1926, which was entirely devoted to authoritative articles on Africa. They were written in preparation for an international conference in Belgium that year between leaders of missions, administrators, and educationists. Edwin Smith wrote up the main results of the conference in *The Christian Mission in Africa* (1926), in which Christian Missions are related to all the new forces which are shaping African life. That was followed next year by an outline of the missionary programme by Donald Fraser in *The New Africa* (1927). A comprehensive and penetrating study of education, indispensable to missionaries, is *The Remaking of Man in Africa* (1931) by J. H. Oldham and B. D. Gibson.

African missions have never lacked great personalities whose recorded doings give colour and concreteness to general studies. For the present day there is Albert Schweitzer with his two books of personal experiences at Lambarene, *On the Edge of the Primeval Forest* (1926) and *More from the Primeval Forest* (1932). One of the newest books has an interest for evangelists everywhere as well as in Africa, because it exemplifies a sound method of presenting Christian truth. Again it is by Edwin Smith, *African Beliefs and Christian Faith* (1936), and its three parts deal with Belief in God among the Africans, Belief in God among the Jews, and The Revelation of God in Jesus Christ. To facilitate easy translation it is written in Basic English, which enhances its lucidity.

This article must end somewhere, so we omit great fields such as The Near East, The Netherlands, Indies, Madagascar, Japan, The South Seas. We also omit two ranges of books each of which could fill another article, one Missions to Moslems, and the other Missionary Biography. Fortunately in the latter case some of the classics are well known, but new ones are appearing of which some deserve to become classics, such as Constance E. Padwick's *Henry Martyn: Confessor of the Faith* (1925), and *Temple Gairdner of Cairo* (1929), or the very different autobiography, Albert Schweitzer's *My Life and Thought* (1933).

Literature.

EZEKIEL.

It is now well over a quarter of a century since Messrs. T. & T. Clark announced that Dr. G. A. Cooke had consented to write the commentary on Ezekiel in the famous *I.C.C.* series. Since then Canon Cooke has done a life's work as Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, and the combination of academic and ecclesiastical duties has prevented him from giving to this book the final form that he would wish it to have. Now, in the early years of his retirement, we have at last before us the fruits of the labours of a lifetime—*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (T. & T. Clark; 20s. net). From time to time we have had hints of the writer's views on some of the problems presented by the book, and we warmly welcome the completed volume. We cannot regret the long period that has been spent over this great task. Ezekiel has received more attention than almost any other part of the Old Testament in recent years, and we have seen a number of theories rise and fall even in the post-war period. It may safely be said that the world of scholarship would have been seriously impoverished if Dr. Cooke had issued his commentary ten years ago. As it is, he has been able to study and appraise a great many important suggestions which have been made by various scholars. He has brought to them a sober judgment, conservative but not too much so, and has submitted them to thorough and discriminating scrutiny. Even where not convinced, he has been ready generously to admit the merits of any theory propounded. The only recent volume on Ezekiel which has not been taken into account is Bertholet's commentary in the *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*, and that appeared almost simultaneously with the English scholar's work.

It is, naturally, impossible to enter into detail in speaking of Dr. Cooke's work. Suffice it to say that he is quite in line with the modern view of the structure and history of the prophetic books in general, that he makes a clear distinction between the poetical and the prose portions of the book, rightly attributing the origin of the latter to the deliberate writing down of the prophet's words and experiences. He recognizes the ecstatic nature of Ezekiel's inspiration, and refuses to accept any conclusion based on a denial of the supernatural. While admitting that there are later accretions in

the book as it now stands (particularly in chs. 43-48), he rejects the theory that Ezekiel was never in Babylonia at all (held, for example, by James Smith and Hertrich), questions the soundness of Kraetschmar's view of the double text, and eschews both Hölscher's drastic criticism and Torrey's fantastic reconstruction of the history of the book. The exegesis is as sound as the criticism, and the many unpleasant things which Ezekiel has to say are handled with both frankness and tact. In spite of the enormous mass of detail which such a commentary necessarily involves, we get a clear and living impression of the prophet and of his message. The textual and philological notes are full and lucid, always marked by a meticulous accuracy. Some readers will feel it a drawback in the arrangement of the book that these two classes of notes are not separated from one another. This may be due to the need for economizing space, and the same reason may account for the absence of a bibliography. It should be added that the book contains some admirable plans of the Temple as envisaged by Ezekiel, though Dr. Cooke wisely avoids trying to reproduce the cherubim-chariot. The volume as a whole is a notable contribution to Old Testament studies, adding distinction to British scholarship, and a worthy summary of the life-work of a really great scholar.

THE SPIRIT OF METHODISM.

In the Fernley-Hartley Lecture for 1937, under the title of *The Spirit of Methodism* (Epworth Press; 6s. net), the Rev. Henry Bett, M.A., Litt.D., of Handsworth College, Birmingham, has made a detailed study of the religious experience of John Wesley, and of the special contributions which Methodism has made to religion, theology, literature, and social progress. He has also sought to trace the relation of Methodism to the past, and to estimate its prospects as a religious community in the future. The best chapters are undoubtedly those which discuss the contributions of Methodism to the life and thought of the last two hundred years. Packed with valuable information, and written in an attractive and forceful style, these four chapters grip the attention of the reader, and make it difficult to put the book aside. In estimating the theological contribution of Methodism, Dr. Bett shows that Wesley and the early Methodists

grounded religion and theology in the fact of experience. He finds the second contribution of Methodism in the fact that 'it made an end of Calvinism, for all practical purposes,' and the third in the new emphasis it laid upon the doctrine of sanctification and in the new exposition which it gave.

Dr. Bett sees the literary contribution in the matchless hymns of Charles Wesley, and in the prose writings of John Wesley and of the early Methodist preachers. Particularly fresh and arresting are his conjectures of how the founder of Methodism would have written in his 'Thoughts upon Slavery' if he had copied the style of Addison or of Samuel Johnson. 'No unprejudiced jury of literary men,' he claims, 'would deny that Wesley's *Journal* is one of the most important and one of the most interesting books of the century, and that his prose style is as powerful and precise an instrument as Swift's; that Charles Wesley is the greatest of all English writers of devotional verse, and that his hymns are really a landmark in the renaissance of English poetry.'

The treatment in much the greater part of Dr. Bett's fine book is admirable, both in presentation and in matter, but his study of the relation of John Wesley to the past is open to the objection that he so overstates the Moravian and Pietist influences that less than justice is done to his heritage from the English Church. Dr. Bett is also so much on his guard against recent attempts to emphasize the more Catholic elements in the teaching of the Wesleys that he fails to consider the significance of the hundred and sixty-six 'Hymns on the Lord's Supper,' with the Preface from Dr. Brevint's 'The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice,' which reached its *tenth* edition in 1794. His contention is that Wesley's attitude was mainly pragmatic. 'He found that, as a matter of fact, these hallowed rites brought blessing to the believing soul, and therefore he urged them upon his people. That is the truth, and practically the whole truth, of the matter.' Surely, this is a patent under-statement!

In estimating the future development of Methodism, Dr. Bett shows himself doubtful, on the whole, about Reunion. 'There is no great future for Methodism,' he says, 'if it becomes characterless and colourless, and practically indistinguishable from the other evangelical communities. But there is a great future for it if it will be faithful to its own peculiar genius.'

JUDAISM AND CHRISTIANITY.

During the winter session of 1935-36 a course of lectures was delivered at King's College, London, on the Age of Transition from Judaism to Christianity, by Dr. W. O. E. Oesterley, Professor E. O. James, Mr. Herbert Loewe, and Professor S. H. Hooke. They have now been published by the Sheldon Press (the Preface is written by Dr. W. K. Lowther Clarke) as the first volume of a series called 'Judaism and Christianity'—*The Age of Transition* (10s. 6d. net). It is right that this should be done, for the lectures deserve the widest possible audience, and form a very important contribution to the study of both the religions concerned. The names of the writers in themselves would have been an adequate guarantee of the excellence of the work. Dr. Oesterley contributes four lectures on the general historical background, the Wisdom and Apocalyptic writings, and on the belief in angels and demons. He has long been known as the leading authority in this country—possibly in Europe—on three of these subjects, and shows himself to be equally at home in the general background. His work is a marvel of compression, simple and clear, of the vast mass of knowledge at his disposal, and, while he has added little that is new to what he has written already on these matters, it is a real advantage to have a restatement. Professor James's chapter on religion in the Græco-Roman world should be compared with such a book as Dr. T. R. Glover's 'Conflict of Religions in the Early Roman Empire'; in this essay the reader will find especially valuable the account of Orphism and other types of 'Mystery religion.' The other two authors are, perhaps, not so well known to the Christian public, in spite of their high standing among specialists, and their work here is of remarkable interest. Mr. Loewe represents the same enlightened type of Jewish scholar as did his predecessor in Cambridge, Dr. Israel Abrahams. His study of Pharisaism raises a number of curious questions. The outstanding problem is the relation of Jesus to the Pharisees as depicted in the Gospels. As Abrahams and Montefiore have helped us to realize, the genuine Pharisaic teaching, as it has come down to us in the Talmud, was in harmony with that of Jesus on almost every point, even in matters where the Gospel record represents them as being most at variance. Mr. Loewe utters a solemn warning against rash generalizations; the Pharisees who took counsel with the Herodians against Jesus were far from being typical of their sect. Indeed, Mr. Loewe

goes so far as to hint at the possibility that it was not really Pharisees at all, but Sadducees with whom Jesus came into conflict. But Mr. Loewe's attitude towards Jesus is even more striking than his defence of the true Pharisaism, and it may be said that he goes as far in his appreciation of Jesus as it is possible to go without actually becoming a Christian. Pages 160 ff. should be read and studied by every one who wishes to get a clear light on Jesus as He was. Professor Hooke's three chapters are equally illuminating. In those on the way of the initiate and Christianity, and the Mystery religions, he discusses a problem with whose outlines most readers will be familiar, though there is much here that will be new to them. The conclusion reached is that, mainly owing to their Jewish ancestry, we cannot ascribe to the Mystery religions any serious influence on Christianity, though their vocabulary was used by New Testament writers with some freedom. It is in the last chapter of all that Professor Hooke reaches his greatest height, as he discusses the emergence of Christianity from Judaism. Here we have a brilliant summary of the spiritual history of Israel, leading up to a devout and sympathetic interpretation of Jesus, with special stress on the part which the Cross played in His thought. The chapter forms a fitting climax to an extraordinarily interesting and important book.

AN IMPORTANT BOOK FOR RELIGIOUS TEACHERS.

We have used the word 'important,' but we might have used an even stronger word for a new book on the reading and teaching of the New Testament—*The New Testament: A Guide to Bible Reading for Schools and Colleges for the Use of Teachers and Pupils*, by Mr. A. C. Toyne, M.A. (Lutterworth Press; 8s. 6d. net). The book is an ambitious one, but with a noble ambition, to make the New Testament intelligible and credible to young people, and especially to commend the gospel in its fulness to them. It is 'a text-book on the Christian Religion founded on New Testament Study.' The author pays a compliment to youth when he says that his work is chiefly designed for boys and girls of fourteen to eighteen years of age, for this large volume discusses the deepest questions of religious thought in a thorough manner. He assumes a certain knowledge of facts, and discusses the religious significance of these rather than the facts and events themselves. He also generously assumes that boys and girls who can learn the meaning of

expressions like gerundive, isobar, congruency of triangles can also learn the meaning of words like immanence, eschatology, sanctification, and logos.

The first part of the book deals with the religious content and literary problems of the Synoptic Gospels, Acts, Romans, and St. John. It contains two sections on the religious and ethical teaching of Jesus, in which with admirable frankness and freedom from tradition the author states and discusses some of the acute problems raised by Jesus' words. A section on the literary characteristics of the Synoptic Gospels gives a sufficiently full account of their historical trustworthiness. The same treatment is given to Acts. A long chapter of fifty pages furnishes a summary of the contents of Romans, and one nearly as long deals with St. John. The second part of the book contains summaries of the other New Testament books, with general remarks on their value and teaching.

This bald summary of a remarkable book gives little indication of the rich material it offers to the teacher. The sincerity and freshness with which the acute points of our Lord's teaching are handled, the clearness with which the critical issues in the Fourth Gospel are stated, and the admirable description of the gradual way in which belief in the Incarnation came to the New Testament writers, may serve as examples. One feels that Mr. Toyne has gone to the New Testament and looked at it with his own eyes. It would be a heartening thing to think that such a book as this will actually be used in schools. At any rate no book of recent times is more calculated to promote real religious education as distinct from the teaching of 'facts.' We most warmly wish it a wide influence in the educational world.

THE TOTALITARIAN STATE.

Religion and the Totalitarian State, by Sir Charles Grant Robertson, C.V.O., M.A., LL.D. (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net), is a reprint and enlargement of the Beckly Social Service Lecture for 1937, in which the author has analysed the principles of the Totalitarian State and of religion respectively, and has attempted to show the possible relation between them. His main thesis is that it is impossible for any religion worthy of the name to submit to the claims of the Totalitarian State to be a transcendent entity of absolute value with a right to the unqualified allegiance of its subjects, without being false to the essential obligations of religion. Christianity implies a belief in the Divine government of the universe, and regards the State as part, but part

only, of the order consequent on that government. For the Christian the individual human personality has supreme value, and cannot be sacrificed at the behest of the State. He believes further in a Kingdom of God, with which even the most perfectly organized human society cannot be forthwith identified. The autonomy of the Church is inherent in its very nature, and can only be recognized, and not conferred, by the State. The Church does not, indeed, claim to be an *imperium in imperio*; its authority belongs to a different sphere, that of the individual conscience and the relation of the human soul to God, in respect of which it can brook no interference from the State.

The consequence of these contrasts, according to the author, is a challenge to the Christian Church which it 'cannot evade without committing suicide.' It must resolutely oppose any attempt of the State to dominate education, as well as all the other agencies of propaganda, so greatly increased by modern invention, which have as their aim the complete control of the thought-life of the citizens. The Church must show also that sheer nationalism and racialism are a travesty of Christianity. In order to fulfil its function the Church must, above all, close its ranks: 'divide and defeat,' says the author, 'is a fatal gift to present to your opponents.' Finally, the Church must not be faint-hearted, and sell her birthright for an accommodating peace by saying that Christianity has to do only with the concerns of the individual, and need not involve itself in matters affecting the community. The Church exists as a society or not at all, and as a society it must save civilization even at the edge of the abyss. If the lecture had been published within the last few days, Sir Charles Robertson might have quoted appositely from the Manifesto of the Evangelical Churches in Germany, read from their pulpits on Sunday, September 5, in which they demand 'full freedom to preach the undiluted Gospel,' and state that at the present time 'a Church conscious of doing its duty is treated in large parts of the Fatherland as an enemy to be fought and destroyed.'

A really delightful book of essays comes from a preacher and writer who, though an American, is very well known and much appreciated on this side of the water—*The Civilized Mind*: Forest Essays, second series, by Lynn Harold Hough, Dean of Drew Theological Seminary (Abingdon Press; \$2.00). Dr. Hough may be described as a religious humanist. He is a man of letters who is

at home in theology, and in these essays he contends that real humanism must find its completion in the gospel. He sets this forth in a brilliant example in his essay on Paul Elmer More, who is apparently one of his heroes. Another is Professor Babbitt, and these two names crop up in many of the essays. They are not as well known here as perhaps they ought to be, but Dr. Hough's references to them and their writings awaken our curiosity and may lead many to make their acquaintance.

The essays in this volume are of a miscellaneous character—'Books on my Study Table,' 'The Intellectual Life of the Preacher,' 'The Queen of the Sciences in our Time,' 'Liberty and Law'—but they all bear on the main theme, the crying need of our time for the Christian message. Dr. Hough is severe on the average American preacher and on the moral and spiritual condition of the age. The 'civilized mind,' the mind of Plato, Virgil, Shakespeare, Goethe, Sainte-Beuve, Matthew Arnold, is almost extinct, and can only be resuscitated by the quickening power of faith. How sympathetic and understanding Dr. Hough can be, on the other hand, is revealed in a perfectly charming essay on 'Britain through American Eyes,' the insight of which is matched only by its generosity.

What is the relationship between culture and religion? How are secular activities related to religious activities? The Church has always found in the trivial round, the common task, the sphere of discipline and service. But what of the other activities we *choose*—art, literature, science, the novels we read, the plays we see, the games we play? What is the relation of all this to religion? How far is culture involved in the religious life? These are the questions dealt with in the latest Swarthmore Lecture on *Religion and Culture*, by Miss Caroline C. Graveson, B.A. (Allen & Unwin; 2s. 6d.; paper, 1s. 6d. net). Emphasis is often laid on the simplicity of the Christian life, on the irrelevance of learning to the Kingdom of God. And we need to be clear about the place humanism and culture play in our religious life. They have been divorced far too long. And, as Miss Graveson contends, one of our urgent needs is to 'enlarge the country of God' so as to compass in it more of the interests of life. This is fully in accord with the Quaker doctrine of the sacramental life, and the book before us may be regarded as an intelligent exposition of modern Quaker principles.

Professor A. Campbell Garnett, M.A., Litt.D., of the University of Wisconsin has written *Reality and*

Value, which he describes as 'an Introduction to Metaphysics and an Essay on the Theory of Value' (Allen & Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). As an introduction to philosophical studies it will serve students admirably. We do not mean that it is a book only for beginners. But it gives such a lucid and readable account of various theories which it is of consequence to know, that the student will find himself soundly instructed and wisely guided into the heart of philosophical discussion. The writer's main interest is in the theory of values; but because he believes that we are aware of the reality of values in precisely the same way as we are aware of the reality of other things, and that our knowledge of mind is as direct and reliable as our knowledge of the material world, he begins with Epistemology, analysing the process of knowledge in general. His most important contention is that our knowledge of God and of the good rests upon a direct acquaintance as unequivocal as in the case of our knowledge of the self and the world.

The style is simple and the argument is developed by easy stages, and altogether we can most cordially recommend the work.

Fourteen years ago there appeared in German a small book which has exercised a profound influence. It was written by Martin Buber. Mr. Ronald Gregor Smith has translated it into English—*I and Thou* (T. & T. Clark; 2s. 6d. net). We congratulate Mr. Smith on the felicity of his translation. We are grateful, too, for the excellent introductory chapter in which he sets forth both the essentials of Buber's teaching, and the wide range of influence which Buber's little but pregnant work has exerted. If we may make one suggestion, it would be that in the next edition, which we hope will be called for soon, a short account might be given of Buber himself; for we are fairly certain that to many in this country next to nothing is known of him. Buber, as the book reveals, is a mystic, a poet, a profound philosopher, and a deeply religious man. Never, except in Pascal's 'Pensées,' has philosophical thought been expressed in this way. The book is written in short paragraphs, not disconnected but separable. The style is poetical, and the whole is mysticism in the best sense. Buber's main position is that there is a vital difference between a man's attitude to persons and to things. But inevitably to man another person becomes an object—'thou' becomes an 'it.' God, however, is a 'Thou' which never becomes an 'it'; God may be only 'addressed' never 'expressed.' The influence of this distinction is very clearly traceable in Karl Heim.

I and Thou is one of the books that will live and prove life- and light-giving.

Books of prayers for young people often disappoint, sometimes because of the unsuitable language employed, and sometimes because the thought is not what would naturally enter a child's mind. It seems as difficult to write a prayer for children as to make an appropriate address for them. However, *Prayers for School Use*, by Mr. C. M. Fox (Lutterworth Press; 2s. 6d. net), is somewhat exceptional, both in sentiment and language. The prayers are brief (an indispensable quality), and simple and comprehensive. The rubrics are for special occasions, all sorts and conditions of men, mental and bodily vigour, faithful service, our relations with God and victory over sin, and a right relation with others. There are suitable readings after each prayer.

King of Kings, a Devotional Commentary on St. Matthew's Gospel, by the Rev. Hugh C. C. McCullough (Marshall, Morgan & Scott; 2s. 6d. net), is constructed on the basis of the Coronation of King George. The ceremonial of the Coronation is used to illustrate our devotion to the King of kings. Chapters are devoted to the Royal Proclamation, the Divine Sovereignty, the Crown Jewels, the King's Keys, and so on. The symbolism is obvious, and the exposition is full of devout and edifying insight.

Clever but not always convincing is the verdict we feel constrained to pass on Mr. F. Hugh Capron's answer to Spiritualism set forth in *The Highway to Heaven and a Byway to Nowhere* (Methuen; 5s. net). The highway is the orthodox Christian faith as founded on Scripture; the byway is Spiritualism. Mr. Capron is persuaded in his own mind that Spiritualism is a dangerous rival to true Christianity, and devotes his keen critical faculties to showing its unsatisfactory nature. He limits his view, however, mainly to one widely circulating spiritualistic book which attempts to conserve all the Bible narratives by giving a spiritualistic interpretation. Thus when the Bible says 'God spake to' a prophet, the interpretation is that the prophet's spirit-guide revealed. Mr. Capron has no difficulty in showing to what absurdity as well as violence to the Scripture such a treatment leads. He thinks and says that Spiritualists can logically believe in no Spirit save incarnate human spirits, and in consequence God has disappeared. The trouble is that no Spiritualist we have met would ever agree that

such was actually his view of Spirit. Yet the book is far from being without value, and we commend a perusal of it to any tempted to desert the 'highway for the byway.'

Guidance about public prayer and the celebrating of Holy Communion is given to ministers of the Anglican Church in *Liturgy in the Parish*, by members of the Alcuin Club (Mowbray; 2s. net). This is the first volume of 'Alcuin Leaflets,' each of which (here bound together) can be obtained separately. The chapter headings will indicate the contents of the volume—Praying with the Church, The Consecration of the Eucharist, English Use, The Parish Eucharist, The Catholic Altar and Processions. Much interesting and useful detail is given on the various topics.

In the 'Needs of To-day' series, Father Martindale, S.J., has produced a little book, *Does God Matter for Me?* (Rich & Cowan; 3s. 6d. net). It is not exactly an apology for faith. That is provided in Dr. Alington's 'Can We Believe in God?' It deals mainly with the consequences which such a belief has in human life. But as a matter of fact Father Martindale cannot keep his hand off the main problem of belief. And one of his chief points is that man can find certainty of God's existence by the exercise of his reason. He rightly protests against the modern belittling of reason, and the tendency to base faith on intuition or some other non-rational function, and on this point he is very definite and convincing. But the substance of his book has to do with the effects on ourselves of belief, and there are chapters on God Paramount, God our Rescuer, God our Enrichment, God controlling Me, and God and Human Society.

One of the charms of this book is its discursive-ness. The writer roams over all fields, dealing with Freud, Marx, and other sponsors of heresies, and he makes it all relevant to his main theme. He was asked by the publishers to make his book practical, popular, and personal. And it is all three. Indeed, it is written in an easy, conversational style that makes it a pleasure to read. It would be difficult to find a better guide to inquiring minds that are not accustomed to grapple with academic language, but want real thinking expressed in familiar terms. Father Martindale does not write as a Roman Catholic, but there is the usual 'Nihil Obstat' and 'Imprimatur,' and the books suggested for further reading seem to be Romanist publications. But this ought not to deter any reader from the study of this racy and helpful volume.

In *Recent Psychic Experiences* (Seeley, Service; 5s. net), Mr. E. A. Reeves gives an account of 'manifestations' he received at various times. He was till lately map curator and instructor in surveying to the Royal Geographical Society. For many years members of practically all exploring expeditions that have left our shores have received instruction from him, including those of Scott and Shackleton. He thus has had a scientific training, and may be regarded as not too credulous. In his book he tells us of visions and communications that gave him information otherwise unobtainable. He saw his mother and heard from her both directly and indirectly. He was told about the anxiety of a sister to see him by a medium who apparently could read his sister's mind. And in many other ways he was brought into contact with the Unseen. Those who are interested will find the evidence for all this set down with modesty, but also with firm conviction. One thing ought to be stated. Mr. Reeves, unlike many spiritualists, is a Christian in the full sense by belief.

The Patience of God, by the Rev. A. H. Thompson (S.P.C.K.; 3s. 6d. net), is a book of devotional meditations of a rare quality. In successive chapters on the Divine patience in the universe, in revelation, in grace, with man, with the soul, and then on human patience with ourselves, with one another and with God, the writer leads the reader to 'green pastures and waters of comfort.' The book will be a good gift to the sick, the sorrowful, and all who find life hard. But indeed, as we all need the patience of God, it is a book for everybody. Mention must be made of the beautiful prayers at the end of the chapters, and also of the fineness of the writing.

Mr. J. F. Mozley, M.A., is convinced that William Tyndale is a man who has never yet received his due, whose 'reputation has been at the mercy of ignorance and partisanship.' So he has set himself to a fresh study of all available sources from which the authentic details of the life and work of 'a great Englishman and a great Christian man' may be gathered, and has given us a truly noble account of him in *William Tyndale* (S.P.C.K.; 12s. 6d. net). He tells us that even this work is not the final record, but we are sure that for a considerable time to come it will be the standard work of reference. Tyndale's interesting and finally tragic story is here set forth in felicitous style, and for every fact full evidence is produced. Facts long concealed in State Papers or buried in learned magazines are here

resurrected and made known to the reading public ; to give only one example, we get notice of a letter in Tyndale's own hand which had reposed unread amid the archives of the Council of Brabant for more than three hundred years. All who are interested in the Reformation, and more especially in our English Bible, will turn with avidity to this learned, fascinating, and reliable account of one whose name deserves to be held in everlasting and grateful remembrance.

During last autumn a group of friends met in Westminster to consider the possibility of taking some steps towards making more effective in relation to problems of the day the great body of Christian feeling which exists in all classes of society. It was decided to promote as far as possible the study of some of the chief contemporary problems with a view to reaching a body of agreement on which action could be taken. A manifesto was issued and received a fair measure of publicity. The Archbishop of York was one of the group, and he has written a brief pamphlet, *Christian Democracy* (S.C.M. ; 6d. net), to set out more fully what was in the minds of those who approved the manifesto. The main purpose of the booklet is to show the intrinsic kinship between the ultimate intuitions of the Christian faith and the attitude towards life which is expressed in and encouraged by reliance on reason. One conclusion is that democracy is best fitted to carry into human affairs the Christian conception of man, and also that democracy can only survive if it is Christian. But the principle is illustrated in other ways, in the individual's relation to society, in regard to our attitude to war, and also in our relation with the present social structure. The argument is luminous, and Dr. Temple's essay should receive wide attention.

Everything that Professor Reinhold Niebuhr writes is of great value, and his Burge Memorial Lecture for 1937 is specially timely. It bears the challenging title *Do the State and Nation belong to God or the Devil ?* and is published by the S.C.M. at the price of sixpence. It is therefore within the reach of all, and we should like to see it in the hands of a great multitude in all lands. Professor Niebuhr's own answer to his own question comes to this—in both nation and State there is something of God, but far too much of the Devil. The State needs power, any pacifism which is so radical as to renounce all power can lead only to sentimental individualistic anarchy. But the craving for power

is man's perennial temptation, and power inevitably tends to displace justice. The popular pacifism which would substitute 'spiritual' power for violence cannot guarantee that in wielding 'spiritual' power a nation or State or class would not likewise do violence to justice. The Papacy is the outstanding historical instance. To solve the problem of power is not easy. The existence of a strong and real democracy keenly critical of those into whose hands power has been entrusted will be useful, but negatively rather than positively. Better will be the recognition and acknowledgment of a Divine Majesty which transcends all temporal sovereignties. Ideally Christianity does this, and teaches this ; but the Church has only too often been corrupted into subservience to nationalism. The prophet too easily becomes the priest ; not a keen critic of what is, but the defender of the established system.

There has been a pause in the spate of books about modern psychology. But in *Psychology: The Changing Outlook*, by Professor Francis Aveling, M.C., D.Lit., D.Sc., Ph.D. (Watts ; 2s. 6d. net), we have one from the competent hand of the Professor of Psychology in the University of London, and we naturally expect something of a special quality and authority from such a source. The book is one of a series, 'The Changing World Library,' that is apparently intended to have a popular appeal. Dr. Aveling has not yielded to this idea so far as to make his book easy reading. The book is a serious effort to present to serious readers the present situation in the psychological world, and that is not easy in the limited space allowed him. One result is that there is a lack of definite illustration to make the argument grip, and also of criticism of the various theories. The book is expository, not critical, but it would have been more useful if Dr. Aveling had revealed his own mind more freely. Psychology is in an extraordinary state of confusion at present. There are nearly as many psychologies, or schools of psychology, as there are instincts, and some of them are flatly contradictory in essential matters to others. The inexperienced reader may be warned that some of the theories expounded here are open to very real question, and he should supplement the exposition by further study. But with these qualifications it may be said that a very fair and (within limits) sufficient account is given here of the different psychological theories, and also of the applications of these to industry, education, medicine, and criminology.

Old Texts in Modern Translations.

Numbers x. 29-32 (Moffatt).

BY THE REVEREND JOHN A. IRVINE, B.A., BIGGAR.

'MOSES said to his father-in-law Hobab, the son of Reuel the Midianite, "We are starting for the country which the Eternal has promised to give us; come along with us and share in our prosperity, for the Eternal has promised to prosper Israel." "I will not go," he answered, "I will depart to my native country and my kinsfolk." But Moses said, "Pray do not leave us, for you know where we can camp in the desert; come and be a pair of eyes for us, and as the Eternal prospers us, so will we prosper you."'

The writer has done well. It would be a dull imagination and a prosaic mind indeed that was not kindled by this great story and that did not feel how much more lay behind than the mere record of a migratory movement of some desert tribes. It is another out-cropping of the age-long conflict between the seen and the unseen, between the tyranny of sense and the challenge of faith.

Here we have the first account of the setting out, and the details of it are worthy of a great occasion. The two silver trumpets, the preparation of the various divisions, the ordered discipline are all part of a great enterprise. So the tale unfolds, and one watches clan after clan depart, moving off along the untrodden way until all are on the march.

Do we not feel the thrill of the great sight, and can we not understand how Moses turns round to Hobab, his face shining, his soul aflame, and says, 'Come along with us and share our prosperity, for the Eternal has promised to prosper Israel.' How could any man stand out against such an appeal, who could resist such an alluring call?

So is it with the appeal the Church of Christ is making to us all at the opening of the new campaign this autumn for the recall of the nation to religion: 'the opportunity to realize afresh the things which matter most to us, to make plain where we are and what we stand for, and, turning our hearts humbly and expectantly toward God, receive more life and power.'

'Come thou with us, and we will do thee good.' Let us look at the grounds of this assurance. First of all, there is the importance of making a moral decision, new and quick and final. The words rendered in the Authorized Version, 'We are

journeying,' are really far more suggestive than that. More accurately what Moses says is 'We are starting.' There is something fresh about this. The long waiting-time is past. Hobab had been with them during the days of the encampment, had moved in and out amongst them until the whisper ran round of a change and of a great eventful moment having arrived. Here was a new commencement, a break with the drab past, 'We are starting,' 'Come along with us.'

It is a great thing to have to make a moral decision, to face things in a new way, to strike tents, to step out with new resolves. That does every man good, it stirs our sluggish natures, it compels to new ventures of the soul.

Such hours, whenever and however they come, and come they do to all, face us with that heart-searching question, Have you made the best of your life? And if you must say No, if in spite of all the varied interests and all the feverish attempts to reach something that will make life worth while, you have failed, and are still unsatisfied, then 'Come along with us' the Church is saying. 'We are just on the point of starting, do not be left behind.' The very swiftness and urgency of the choice have spiritual value. It may be possible to join the cavalcade *en route*, but it is better far to be there at the start.

Note, secondly, the venture of faith. All that Moses could give to Hobab was just the assurance of God's promise, 'We are starting for the country which the Eternal has promised to give us.' This bare naked promise of God might mean much to Moses steeped in a religious past, but to a man like Hobab what could it mean? It was a venture, there was nothing to be seen, the reward had to be waited for, and fought for, the goal was out of sight. It was all very well this marching out so bravely, this blowing of trumpets, but in the end it might come to nothing. And so Hobab says as men are so ready to do, 'A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush,' 'I will not go. I will depart to my native country and my kinsfolk.' At any rate he knew where he was with them, and the hazards of the desert march, and the perils of the conflict, did not appeal to him.

There are souls all around us feeling like that. They do not dislike goodness, but they are not going to make any great sacrifice for it. The whole thing for them is too vague, too far away, religion bores them, and religious people are not attractive, not their sort any more than the Israelites were Hobab's, and so they say, 'I will not go. I will depart to my native country and my kinsfolk.'

But it is not a question of whether you feel religious associations appeal to you, rather it is whether you will let the great moment slip past of learning that 'Man does not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.' 'Come along with us' and you will find the real worth of consecrated lives some day, and how great and ennobling a power in life true religion is where you find it at its best. And it can be found at its best, the pure home life, the loving relationships, the calm steadfastness of purpose under overwhelming calamities, the forgetfulness of self in devotion to a great cause, the power to ride out the storm, the humble submission to the Divine will, the triumphant assurance that all things work together for good.

All these fine qualities are rooted in a sincere and simple faith, a devout, personal trust in God. For, as Dr. Fosdick puts it, 'Man needs desperately the ministry of religion, its insight into life's meaning, its control over life's use, its inward power for life's moral purpose.'

Thirdly, there is the romance of the venture. The finest touch of all, in this story, is the closing one. Moses could not bear to think of Hobab missing this great opportunity in life. Yet the man's mind seemed made up. There was only one thing to do. Hobab did not grasp the real significance of Israel's journeying and national future, and Moses could not stay to argue with him, so he made the appeal for the man's help, 'Pray do not leave us, for you know where we can camp in the desert; come and be a pair of eyes for us.' That won the day, and Hobab went with them, and ever after Israel remembered the kindness he showed them.

Now every one has a gift if only we had the insight to find it. You can win men sometimes, who would be otherwise unyielding, if you can make them aware that they have a contribution to bring. It may be they have power to organize, capacity to teach, ability to handle others, and once they have been caught in the great movement of the Kingdom of God a new interest may awake, the appeal of its grandeur may touch them, the new fellowship created may bring a wider sympathy, a better understanding of how noble a thing Christian living can be. The indifference, the worldliness, the self-centredness, the easy morals may drop from them, and they put on the Lord Jesus Christ, and are clothed with a new beauty.

That William the Silent became the Christian hero of the sixteenth century he owed to the fact that under God he took up the defence of the oppressed Christians of the Netherlands. Coming to that enterprise merely as a wealthy magnate and far-seeing politician, the sacredness of the cause passed into his soul, and to quote Motley's great tribute, 'without a particle of cant or fanaticism he had become a deeply religious man. Hitherto he had been only a man of the world and a statesman, but from this time forth he began to rely upon God's providence in all the emergencies of his eventful life. . . . His religion was not a cloak to his designs, but a consolation in his disasters.'

Are there not openings in the large enterprises of God's purpose for which, unknown to us, and unsuspected by themselves, the right men are ready? Are there not endowments in the wide field of human character which only need to be released to bring enrichment to the Church, gifts all the more valuable because not of the common order? Are we too cramped, too conventional, to find the use God may have for such souls?

When once He has girded them, though they have not known Him, those Hands that 'out of darkness reach through nature moulding men' can set them to tasks that wake new visions, that call for strength that must be sought beyond themselves, that bring them up to closed doors for which Christ alone holds the key.

Discontinuity in the Physical and the Spiritual.

BY THE REVEREND W. J. MASSON, B.D., EDINBURGH.

IF a certain thing is found in the physical realm, it does not follow that its counterpart must exist in the spiritual. Yet seeing that the same God is over both spheres, we may be allowed to expect a certain correspondence between them, and at least to assume the possibility of His using in the higher the methods of working which we find Him using in the lower. If, in the latter, He acts in two ways, it is *a priori* improbable that He limits Himself to one in the former. Now, that there is continuity, growth, in both the physical and the spiritual, no one will question. But what of discontinuity, catastrophe? Modern theology tends to ignore or belittle it, but can that be wise when it plays such a large and important part in the realm of Nature?

One thinks, first of all, of the Quantum Theory which Whitehead thus describes clearly if somewhat crudely, 'Some effects which appear essentially capable of gradual increase or gradual diminution, are, in reality, to be increased or decreased only by certain definite jumps. It is as though you could walk at three miles per hour or at four miles per hour, but not at three and a half miles per hour.'¹ Matter is discontinuous. The distance between the different molecules or atoms is large compared with their size. 'O that this too too solid flesh would melt, thaw and resolve itself into a dew,' wailed Hamlet, but, as a matter of fact, it would not have helped him much had the solid flesh done so; whereas, if he had been able to squeeze all the emptiness out of himself, he would have been reduced to microscopic dimensions. Matter is discontinuous. But now we find that radiation is so also. Light, for example, we used to think of as like a river flowing on steadily, like waves of the sea advancing regularly one after the other, but now we see that that will not do. We must get back to Newton's idea of corpuscular light, and the only way we can combine it with the wave theory, which, for certain reasons, we must still hold, is to think of the waves as done up in packets or groups, moving with a speed of their own, quite different from that of the waves. Even radiation is not continuous.

Let this suffice for physical science. What of biological science, the home country of the theory of evolution which requires that continuity be fundamental? Here the twentieth century has witnessed a great change. Not that there is perfect

unanimity among biologists, but all are agreed upon this, that Darwin's theory must be considerably modified, that there has been no steady progress of the living organism from the unicellular amœba to man, the crown of creation. Even the strictest evolutionists allow it to have been jerky. Some lay stress on 'sports,' claiming that they are 'creative in their function and carry forward the march of life.' Others emphasize inter-breeding and the strange results often produced by it. Still others seek an explanation in the creature's response to its environment. Especially interesting is the theory put forward by one prominent anthropologist. Discussing the origin of man, he emphatically opposes the theory that he is descended from the man-like apes or any of their immediate ancestors. The process of evolution has never been a steady development along one particular line. Rather has it been like the growth of a tree, sending out branches in various directions, but the main stem following a line of its own upward. Some of these branches have withered and fallen off, others still remain with us, but neither are part of the stem. The upward urge of life broke out, for example, into the branch of the reptiles which developed till it produced the huge creatures of the Carboniferous Period. Then it died, leaving only a few twigs of the reptiles we still know alive on the earth. Then from some purely general form of reptile, or perhaps a still more generalized form to which no name could be given, came the first birds, a branch which has sent out its twigs in all directions, but yet only a branch. From some other general form came the next step, and so on it has gone till now, he concludes, evolution has stopped, for there are no more general forms from which the development may come. He may or may not be right in this last assumption, but his theory is an interesting illustration of how, even in the sciences of life, the birthplace of evolutionary thinking, students are being forced to recognize a fundamental discontinuity.

This, of course, is quite unmistakably proved by Mendelism. Through his experiments with tall and dwarf peas, Mendel showed that nothing could alter their nature, that however they were crossed, they still remained true to their original character. There is no way of producing seeds that will give something between these two peas. The one does

¹ *Science and the Modern World*, 161.

not, and cannot be made to, slide into the other.

The anthropologist referred to above also claims that instead of following a line of steady development like the flowing of a river, evolution has been like a river that is constantly held up by dams. There have been periods in which the progress has been very rapid, just as when a river overflows a dam, and then long stretches in which matters were practically at a standstill, flowing with a scarcely perceptible current, like a river between the dams. As an illustration, we may think of the slow progress made by science since the days of the Babylonians and Egyptians, and the breath-catching rapidity of its development in our own day. Captain Whitfield of the P. & O. Steamship Company, in his autobiography, remarks on his own experience of this. 'For hundreds of years,' he writes, 'the world stood still and there was little difference between the conditions during the days of Columbus and my own early sea days less than fifty years ago. But during this interval the progress has been amazing.' Another example of discontinuity or at least of jerky evolution.

The origin of life is still a mystery, though the chemistry of colloids promises us some interesting information and we must beware of building on our ignorance. Yet what can be more discontinuous than the hatching of a chicken from an egg, at one moment shut up in its prison, at the next an air-breathing bird. And we might carry the matter back to the beginning, to the fertilizing of the egg. What a change the entrance of the male element made! So one might well say that the most fundamental fact in the biological sciences, the beginning of a life, is discontinuous.

It was needful to dwell at some length on the situation in biology seeing it played such an important part in the history of human thought, but a brief glance will suffice for the other sciences. Geology, the science of the rocks, hardly needs to inform us that changes take place in the crust of the earth with startling rapidity. There are too many earthquakes to allow us to make any mistake about that. Sedimentary rocks may form through a long continuous process, but igneous rocks and faults are the outcome of catastrophe. The great beds of fossils, which we find in certain places, point in the same direction. It is hardly likely that we should have found them together in such numbers had death come upon them in the usual way. Rather does it seem as if some great calamity had overwhelmed them and blotted out that particular form of life, at any rate, in that district.

And there is astronomy. Continuity would demand that the Solar System came into being as the result of the steady cooling of matter, but have we not all been thrilled by Jeans's tale of the great star that came too near and tore out a piece which went whirling away on its own and finally formed our system and globe? Younghusband in his book, *The Living Universe*, has a picture worth our consideration in this connexion. Here are his own words. 'Then a crust must have formed, and then a most extraordinary event occurred, one of those novelties or newnesses in Nature which are so utterly unpredictable, two gases combined to form something so totally unlike a gas as water. A "jump" of momentous consequence to this earth had been made.'¹

In chemistry it will be sufficient to recall the existence of isotopes, substances with the same chemical properties but different atomic weights, and how the discovery of these has gone to show that the atomic weights of all elements are exact multiples of that of hydrogen, or rather of a quarter of that of helium. There is no shading off from one to the other.

In all branches of scientific investigation, then, it is recognized that discontinuity not only exists, but even plays a very important part in the general economy. Now what about the spiritual realm? What bearing have these facts of Nature upon spiritual truth? As facts, probably very little. But the fact that they are facts means a great deal.

How? It was in 1859 that Darwin published his famous book, *The Origin of Species*, and so started a line of thought which has been fruitful of much good and not a little ill, the theory of evolution. It spread like wildfire, invading every class and rank of life. As Moffatt says in his description of *The Day before Yesterday*: 'If one feature rather than another was characteristic of the age, it was the saturation of the general mind by the thought of what is loosely called "evolution." Before very long we discover men and women, not so much arguing for or against the doctrine, as, almost unconsciously, employing it in their views of the world, past and present. It is in the mental atmosphere wherever you turn during the last quarter of the nineteenth century, crudely applied sometimes, and as crudely challenged, but always there.'² The chief opponent of this theory was, of course, to be found in Christian theology, for it seemed to be in direct opposition to the dogma of creation by God, and for a long time the battle was furious and bitter. However, as so often happens, quondam

¹ P. 34.

² P. 56.

enemies become one's most loyal friends, and to-day it is among theologians that the idea of creation by evolution finds its most resolute supporters. Science may regard it as only one among many influences at work. Philosophy may look askance at its protégé as not so wonderful after all, but most of our theology still tries to be true to the fallen monarch, talking as if slow evolution were God's only way of working, in the earth beneath or in heaven above. This is what rouses the ire of the Barthians. 'In fact,' says Brunner in his *The Theology of Crisis*, 'the idea of the Kingdom of God and that of evolution and progress are mutually antagonistic.'¹ This may be going too far, but scientific thought would certainly agree that far too much stress is laid upon growth in theology, and would accept, for its own sphere, his dictum, 'The thought of discontinuity is basic to every primary doctrine of Christianity.'²

But general charges such as these do not get us anywhere. Let us come down to particulars, and first, the doctrine of the future life. In their Shorter Catechism, the Westminster Assembly Divines stated their belief that 'the souls of believers are, at their death, made perfect in righteousness and do immediately pass into glory.' That statement, of course, was inspired by their hatred of the Romish doctrine of purgatory, and it presented no difficulty to their thinking. Their minds were under the influence of the literal interpretation of Gn 1, where a day consisted of twelve hours and everything appeared out of nothing as soon as God spoke the word. It was a sudden creation of something out of nothing, and they had no difficulty, therefore, in believing in a similar break and new creation when death set the soul free from the body. To modern theological thinking, however, there is great difficulty in such a belief. In fact, it is utterly intolerable, and an intermediate state, sometimes indeed many of them, is claimed to be absolutely necessary, on the ground that we shall need time to become fit for the glory of God's presence. In his *The Valley and Beyond*, Anthony C. Deane writes: 'A reason which probably inclines all of us to believe in some intermediate state between death and heaven, is the profound consciousness of our unfitness, when we die, to pass, without further preparation, into the heavenly state. All of us feel that we have still so much to learn.' Then after referring to those who were killed in the War, and to the heathen, he goes on, 'For ourselves, there may well be a feeling that we shall not at once be fit for heaven

when we die.'³ And he writes thus, although only ten pages previously, he had had to acknowledge that, 'In the sum of the forces which have shaped this world, . . . the factor of catastrophe has been operative.'⁴ So in his well-known book, 'At death, the souls pass into the next stage of their evolution. They are happy and blessed. . . . But they are, as yet, unready for the full vision of God. All God's processes are slow.' Then later he continues: 'God cannot have one method here and another within the veil. One law reigns everywhere in the physical universe; and also in the spiritual universe. It cannot well be that creatures so imperfect as we are, should at death be made perfect in holiness and immediately pass into glory. . . . Those grey toneless lives are not the fit furnishings of Heaven. They are certainly fit for Paradise, and Paradise is but the courtyard of Heaven.'⁵ He too regards catastrophe as an 'also ran,' in the making of the world, and would, therefore, allow it no place at all in the world beyond. But is not that to contradict his own thesis that the same law runs through the physical and spiritual worlds? He certainly does not appreciate how large a part discontinuity has played in the making of this world, but if it has played any part at all here, then, by his own claim, it must play some part there. Evolution does not reign alone here and, therefore, it cannot do so there.

Recognize, however, what has been shown above, that discontinuity plays a very large part here, and then consider death itself. What could be more catastrophic, discontinuous? What greater gulf could there be than that between the living and the dead? It is not a case of evolution when the last sigh is breathed and death claims the body; from that moment the body is quite different. Why deny that the soul can be quite different? To treat the future as merely a continuation of the present is absurd; there may be development there, but if so, we start from an altogether different level. What that will be we cannot tell, but the Catechism may not be far wrong. The mere fact that this would be a break in continuity is neither here nor there. Probably it is a recommendation, for the physical realm declares that God believes in jumps, and there is no bridging the gulf between the temporal and the eternal.

Another old doctrine which has been put out of fashion by our revolutionary thinking is conversion, not that it is said to be impossible, but it is pushed aside as unnecessary, as, indeed, something which ought not to be. The child, we are told, ought to

¹ P. 85.² P. 12.³ P. 150.⁴ P. 140.⁵ P. 61 f.

develop naturally into a religious faith, and, as an example, is quoted the story of General Booth's daughter. Asked by her father if she had found Christ, she replied with the question, 'When did I lose Him?' Those born and brought up in the faith ought to pass on from grace to grace, never coming to Christ because they have never gone away from Him. Some indeed would go further even than this and be incredulous toward, or at least distrustful of, all sudden conversion. Stories such as we have from Dempster in his *Finding Men for Christ* meet with their scorn. The beginning of a new life! No, it cannot be that, for all progress is by a slow process of evolution. Wyatt Lang writes in the introduction to his *A Study of Conversion*: 'It is necessary at the outset to discard the opinion that Conversion is a sudden and uncontrollable phenomenon, for the evidence disproves this; there is no more need for sudden and extraneous intrusion into the mechanism of spiritual expression than into the mechanism of life-expression of any natural organism.'¹ Yet the same author, farther on in the same book, has to say, 'The decision to be effective must be conscious, for the self to be unconscious of its own decision seems to be a contradiction.' Then he goes on—and this is a most interesting confession—'But it frequently happens that a person is unconscious of his indecision. This appears to be the condition of many religious people; a grave weakness in religious bodies springs from the fact that a large proportion of their members have never made a decision. . . . The creative energy which therefore follows decision is lost.'² That illustrates the difficulty in which evolutionary thinking lands us here; it demands a steady growth and at the same time a definite point of decision. But decision is always a turning-point, a start of something new, and, therefore, a break with the past. This is so even if it be merely a decision to continue following the path we have taken hitherto, for there is now a difference, and a big difference; the path is taken deliberately and consciously which was formerly followed unconsciously, and therefore into our lives has come a thing which we never knew before, the temptation to wander from it. Such temptation is unknown to one who is acting unconsciously; it implies choice. To come to a decision, therefore, is to begin a new life, even though the decision be to continue living as before.

Wyatt Lang, in the book referred to above, writes thus of John G. Paton: 'His religious convictions were accepted *en bloc* from his father. . . . He had no conversion-crisis because he was able to

accept, through his father's persistent suggestion, the Reality of God's being and the self-ideal of the "servant of God," before he was twelve years old. . . . He gave himself to God and lived as God's servant, and never knew himself to be otherwise.'³ With this statement, it is interesting to compare Mark Rutherford's description of Thomas Broad in *The Revolution in Tanner's Lane*. 'Being the child of pious parents, and of many prayers, he had never been exposed to those assaults of the enemy of souls which beset ordinary young men, and consequently had not undergone a sudden conversion.' But surely between John G. Paton and Thomas Broad there was a great gulf fixed, a gulf created by Paton's decision to follow Christ.

Truly, evolutionary thinking has here led us into Byepath Meadow and almost into Doubting Castle, and the grip of Giant Despair for Wyatt Lang is quite right in tracing the weakness of the Church to lack of decision on the part of members. So many regard conversion as a turning from evil ways, and, therefore, only for great sinners; but conversion is a turning from any path to Christ, even from the path of unconscious Christianity, and no one is truly a Christian till he has made that choice deliberately. Grenfell of Labrador, speaking of his boyhood days, and what he learned of Christ then, says: 'Religion meant to us a mother who brought Christ right into our family life just by doing daily what He would do in her place, and unquestionably into our personal lives too, even if we were not able to recognize and proclaim the fact vocally in those days, even to ourselves.'⁴ Yet, in spite of that great advantage, he would never have been the man he is, if he had not faced the question of what to do with his life, and decided for Christ. Indeed, the danger of such a Christian training is just that the faith be accepted, but not made real. It was only in the fifteenth year of his ministry that Horace Bushnell had that glorious revelation of the gospel which made his later work so powerful and telling. Was not H. R. L. Sheppard right? 'Vital religious revivals are not concerned with changing men from unbelief to belief, but from mere belief to realization.'⁵ Herbert Gray states the same fact. 'All my experience leads me to believe that a definite moral process, best described as surrender to God in Christ, is at the very heart of any liberating and reconciling religion.'⁶ There must be a conscious decision, a definite break with the past. At the basis of any real spiritual life just as at the basis of physical life

¹ P. 46.

⁴ *What Christ means to Me*, 7.

⁵ *The Impatience of a Parson*, 36.

⁶ *Finding God*, 35.

¹ P. 11.

² P. 199.

and of inanimate matter, lies catastrophe, discontinuity; a vertical conversion, not merely a horizontal one.

Other examples of the need to rethink our thoughts and make allowance for discontinuity might be found in the doctrine of God, the doctrine of man, eschatology, even Biblical criticism, but space forbids, though one would like to dwell upon the harm that has been done by teaching that the conquest of sin is a gradual business in spite of the emphasis which the Gospels lay upon the *immediacy* of the devils' departure when Christ spoke the word.

Vesuvius is a fairly high hill, but the ascent is easy, being accomplished by train. The traveller leaves Naples by the ordinary Circum-Vesuvian Railway, and at Pugliano changes into Cook's line for the ascent. This is a definite break, a discontinuity. At first, however, it does not seem so; for the new line runs parallel to the old for some distance before turning up the hill. Higher and higher it climbs till it arrives at the foot of an incline so steep that no train could ascend it. However, the passengers are not required to change. An engine, working on the rack and pinion system, comes behind and pushes all up the slope. At the top of the gradient, this engine is left, and the

journey continued, as before. In both cases there is change without break in continuity. At the foot of the cone, however, passengers change once more, this time into a funicular railway which carries them straight to the top, a break, and very decided change. Here we have illustrations of the three kinds of change which we find in both the physical and the spiritual realms, change with continuity, change with discontinuity, and discontinuity with no apparent change at first. It would be absurd to deny evolution, continuity, growth. There are many examples of steady development involving no breach with the past; but it is equally absurd to ignore discontinuity, catastrophe. It, too, can show many examples, the start of something new with a clear breach with the past, whether the difference be immediately appreciable or not.

Scientific investigation has shown that in the lower physical realm God uses both methods, and that neither can be said to be more normal than the other. Therefore, there is at least a presumption that He uses both in the higher spiritual realm. Slow growth is not always His process; the gospel is that if any man is in Christ, he is a new creation; and how catastrophic that new creation can be is seen in Paul himself.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Prayer.

BY THE REVEREND RODERICK BETHUNE, M.A.,
ABERDEEN.

'He kneeled upon his knees three times a day.'—
Dn 6¹⁰.

SOME time ago I travelled in a railway compartment with a gentleman whom I didn't know. During part of the journey he read from a very large book. After a time, however, he grew tired, I noticed. His eyes just refused to keep open. Do as he liked, his eyelids would keep coming down for longer and longer intervals until, finally, they stayed down, and he fell fast asleep. Do you remember watching your father fall off to sleep in his chair after that very busy day he had? He had been reading, you remember. But his eyes just wouldn't

keep open. Highly amused, you watched his head roll to one side, and then to the other side, and then drop forward where it was content to remain. The book which he was reading began to slip, and slip, and slip, until, with a crash, it fell upon the floor. Well, greatly amused, I watched the same thing happening in the railway compartment. The large book which my fellow-traveller was holding began to slip, and slip, and slip, until it fell upon the floor of the carriage with a terrific bang! The noise wakened my companion who, pulling himself up, proceeded to deny (as perhaps your father did!) that he had ever been asleep! 'Well, well,' you say, 'there's nothing very startling about that.' You yourself, you declare, would have let the book fall had you fallen asleep, and perhaps you, too, should have denied that you were sleeping. Well, perhaps I should. But this is what I want

you to know. When we reached our destination and I had returned home, I chanced to pick up a book in which there was an article about birds. Much to my surprise, and to my great interest, the writer was asking why it was that while a boy or girl cannot hold a book while asleep a bird doesn't fall off its perch when it goes to sleep. I had often watched my canary going to roost. It pulled one foot and leg close up to its body and, standing on the other foot, would tuck its head under a wing and go to sleep. No matter how long I cared to watch it, my canary never fell. Why? I was very eager to know, and so I read on. The reason, this writer suggested, is that the tendons of a bird's leg are so constructed that, when the leg is bent at the knee, the claws contract and grip whatever they encircle, positively refusing to let go until the knee is unbent again. My canary (like other birds) is a lot wiser than I thought! When it goes to sleep it bends the knee of the leg on which it is standing and, by throwing all its weight upon it, keeps it in that position. The bended knee I discovered, you see, gave the power to the bird to hold to whatsoever it desired.

With that thought in mind, I recalled the story of Daniel, of whom it is said that he kneeled upon his knees three times a day. You know what that means, of course? Three times a day Daniel prayed to God. Now the thing that impresses us about Daniel is his power to hold. In spite of many temptations he held to his faith in God and to his character. Many men tried to rob him of his character, endeavoured to weaken his grip upon his faith, but without success. For Daniel had a secret. He had discovered the secret of the bended knee. Whenever he felt a little weak, or unstable, he got down upon his knees, told everything to God and asked His help, and, as birds by bending the knee are able to hold things, so Daniel took a firmer hold of the things he cherished most.

You and I cannot hold things when we are asleep as birds can. But can't they teach us how to hold things while we are awake? Do you desire to hold the things which are most precious to you—honesty, truthfulness, honour, character? Then you, too, must learn the secret of the bended knee.

The Voice of Silence.

BY THE REVEREND STUART ROBERTSON, M.A.,
LISBON.

'Be still, and know.'—Ps 46¹⁰.

The month of November is not the brightest of months. 'November,' says Chambers's *Book of*

Days, 'is generally regarded as the gloomiest month of the year.' Summer is far enough away to be forgotten, and Christmas is still a distant prospect. Hood finishes a poem on 'November,' in which every line begins, as the name of the month begins, with 'No,' by these doleful lines:

No warmth, no cheerfulness, no healthful ease,
No comfortable feel in any member—
No shade, no shine, no butterflies, no bees,
No fruits, no flowers, no leaves, no birds—
No-ember!

Yet, with all its fogs and winds and rains, November has one distinction above all the months; it is the month in which on the eleventh day and at the eleventh hour there is a Silence of two minutes over all the land.

What is the use of this Silence? What is the use of any silence? A very great one. For silence is not just emptiness, the absence of speech or noise. It is a higher sort of speech; for voices can be heard in silence which noise keeps us from hearing, and there are things that can be said better by silence than by speech.

Mozart was once asked, 'What is the greatest effect in music?' His answer was, 'No music.' Addison, referring to a pause in a fine piece of music, said, 'Methought the short interval of silence had more music in it than any one short space of time before it or after it.' It was said of a famous bishop, 'His talk was rich and full; his silence full of inspiration.' The Bible says, 'Be still, and know that I am God.'

Once when the November Silence fell I was in North London in a noisy street. Motor-cycles clattered like machine-guns. Private cars purred on their way. Heavy lorries and buses thundered past. Horns hooted and yelped. Bells tinkled and clanged. Train whistles screamed. Piano-organs jangled. Horses' hooves clop-clopped on the wood blocks. All the orchestral noises of a great city made up the symphony of sound which beats on our ear-drums every day unceasingly, so that we hardly notice it till it stops.

Then it stopped. It was the Silence. Everything moving froze into stillness. Every noise sank into stillness. Then suddenly I heard a bird singing! Its notes dropped from the sky like a shower of silver music. It had been singing all the while unheard, its notes drowned by the city's noises. When they stopped, it got its chance to be heard.

That is the use of the Silence we keep on that month and day and hour, because on that day, hour, and month nineteen years ago four years of

war and waste and suffering and heart-break came to an end. The Silence gives voices we need to hear their chance to be heard. They are the voices which call to us from the dead in their graves in many lands, and from the dead who had no graves, to take up their task, and work and pray for peace on earth.

The world is noisily busy over a host of problems that press. The hubbub of it all tends to drown these silent voices and make us forget that we are alive to-day because so many men died; forget that we are the children of a great sacrifice and that we must be worthy of it. The task of peace is everybody's task, and unless we take it up with all our heart, all the sacrifices of the War will have been a waste of precious ointment. Therefore we keep silence for two minutes at 11 a.m. every 11th of November that we may listen to the voices of our dead.

Ours is a noisy world; it needs silence and it gets very little of it. And because God knows our need and is mindful of us, He has not forgotten silence. He is like a harpist, who not only plucks the harp-strings to make them sound, but also lays his hand on them to silence their vibrations; and that, too, is part of the music.

He lays His hand on our restless wills and anxious minds and fretted nerves each night and sends sleep and silence; and the wastage of the day is made up in the silence of sleep. Nothing can make up for sleep. Nights on end without it would kill us. Wisely we have forbidden motor-horns to sound at night. Sleep and silence give God a chance to heal and build up our bodies.

Because we are not only bodies but souls, He has given us the silence of the Lord's Day. It is a very broken silence now, more's the pity, for it is as needful for the soul as sleep is for the body, and because body and soul are one we sin against both if we break in on the silence of sleep or the silence of God's Day.

God is always speaking to us, but like the bird on Armistice Day, His voice is drowned and unheard. It needed that silence for me to hear the bird, and it needs the Sunday peace for us to hear God. So He says, 'Be still, and know that I am God,' which is as much as to say, 'You never will really know Me until you are still.'

And just as the 'Two Minutes' Silence gives us a chance to hear the call of the men who died for us, so the silence of the Lord's Day is our chance to hear the call of the Christ, who died for us, in the silence of our own hearts, in the silence of the sanctuary, in the silence of His Holy Table.

It is told of the great actor Macklin that in his

speeches he had three pauses, a short pause, a long pause, and a grand pause, and that he once knocked down a prompter, 'because,' he said, 'he broke my grand pause.'

The Two Minutes' Silence is the short pause; sleep is the long pause, the Lord's Day is God's grand pause. They have a big service to do us. Do not sin against the Silences.

The Christian Year.

TWENTIETH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Christian Unity.

BY THE REVEREND DAVID CAIRNS, B.A., BRIDGE OF ALLAN.

'Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word; that they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one.'—Jn 17²⁰⁻²².

I. These words of Jesus are the charter of the movement for Church Unity. Since He desired it, we must work for it; since He prayed for it, we must believe that His prayer will be answered. The command to seek for Christian Unity is of equal authority with the command to preach the gospel to every creature; both are part of our marching orders as Christians. And so we can apply a saying of James Denney's made on the subject of Foreign Missions to the subject of Church Unity—'Those who do not believe in it have no right to believe in it, for they do not believe in our Lord Jesus Christ.'

But, it may be objected, is not the unity of the Church of Christ a reality already, in spite of its external divisions? Cannot unity be experienced apart from union? It must be admitted that there is an inner unity which embraces all Christian people in so far as they serve the same Master, and remember each other in their prayers. But how poor a thing this unity is to-day, compared with what it might be! And it must be admitted that the outward divisions of the Church to-day are not merely superficial; they answer to a lack of inner unity and sympathy which is a hindrance to the Spirit of Christ. It is true that Christ did not speak of uniformity being necessary to His Church, and it seems as if the Apostolic Church had within it several varieties of order which may even have been an enrichment, but it cannot be questioned that the Early Church was one, not only in faith and inner experience, not only in prayer and mutual charity, but also one outwardly in face of the world

as our Churches to-day are not. And until that outer and inner unity for which Jesus prayed is recovered, we must remain unsatisfied. How is that unity to be attained?

II. Each branch of the Christian Church possesses a certain tradition to which it wishes to bear witness. It believes that there are certain truths that it could never give up without disloyalty to Christ and the gospel. And there are certain other customs and beliefs which have become part of our very being as members of one denomination or another. In those traditions—I use the word in an absolutely general sense—there are things which are of crucial importance; there are other things which had a justification in past times, when they were a necessary protest, perhaps, against abuses. But now they are not of the same importance, in the sight of God; and we cannot always distinguish between the essential and the secondary. As we go forward into the Reunion Movement, in what frame of mind are we to carry with us these traditions of ours? Are we to insist that every one of them be retained, or are we to be ready to jettison them all? Both attitudes are wrong; no Church could adopt the second, while the first would make all hope of reunion impossible. What, then, are we to do? Is not the answer to be found in this prayer of Jesus, He did not just pray that His disciples might be one, but that they might be one *in Him*. We must believe that He knows what in our tradition will be of crucial importance to the united Church, and that He will guide us in our deliberations. Can we not trust Him to safeguard what is of real importance in our contribution?

When it does come to Reunion, the uniting Churches must be prepared to die as separate Churches, in order that new Churches may be born. A Church which is unwilling to die for the sake of the cause of Christ inevitably becomes a parasite. It continues to make claims on the loyalty and wealth of its members. But it has no more a right to these services, for it is no longer the Body of Christ, no longer ready to obey His Spirit, to work, to die for the Kingdom. If the death of a denomination as such is God's will, then much fruit will come of it.

Meantime, all our meetings and deliberations must be in a spirit of forbearance and love. And it is hard to maintain such a spirit in such meetings, when party loyalties and prejudices are easily roused and groups near to each other in sympathy may fraternize in talk on a basis of intolerant criticism of other groups. We must continue to expect that God will show a way through our difficulties, by showing us that we had misunder-

stood each other, or by bringing us to a point where we see that the apparently conflicting truths for which we were contending have all had justice done to them. It was a common experience at the Edinburgh Conference, that the Spirit of God was bringing the delegates into a unity which they had not dared to hope for. When impatience or arrogance of thought or word tended to separate us, then a gentler spirit came on us. And what united us most was the common attendance at worship, where we asked the forgiveness of God for all that had been unworthy, and joined in praising Him. The nearer that Christian men and women come to the Spirit of Christ, the nearer they are to the solution of the outstanding problems that separate them. Let us join as far as ever we can in worship with those who belong to different denominations, for that is the way in which we shall come into closest touch with the Spirit of Christ, and with each other.

III. The unity we are seeking is only a means to an end—‘that the world may believe.’ For the Church has no glory in itself, it has only the glory which God gives to it. And He does so only as it works for the Kingdom of God, only as it performs the duty assigned to it by Jesus, of bringing men to Him. The more we live in His Spirit, the more we shall see the differences that separate us in their true proportions. It has been asserted that it is the scandal of the Church that it emphasizes doctrine rather than life. But the Church must be concerned with doctrine, and it is only a scandal when its doctrine loses touch with life. We Churchmen are often terribly lacking in pity and sympathy for all the millions who are in the dark, the inhabitants of great cities who are adrift in the sea of humanity without anchorage in God, the heathen of Africa and China and India, the poor, the blind, the bruised, the broken-hearted. Any discussion on dogma, which has not behind it a burning memory of those eyes filled with despair, and those hands stretching forth from the darkness, is nothing more than a piece of ecclesiastical millinery. The Edinburgh Conference was reminded by Bishop Azariah of Dornakal on the opening day of the Conference, of the crucial situation of the Christian Church in India. ‘We go to the peoples of India,’ he said, ‘and tell them that in Christ they will find the answer to their problems, and the unity that will transcend their divisions. When they come to us, and they are beginning to come, they say, “You ask us to join the Christian Church, but which of your Churches do you ask us to join? You say that in Christ there is unity, but you are

divided amongst yourselves !” I beg you to remember in your discussions that this is the situation that we will have to face when we return home.’

IV. If we go forward towards unity in the spirit which is ready to accept the guidance of God’s Spirit, determined always to seek for the truth in charity and humility and generosity towards those members of the Church with whom we are least in sympathy, then the day will come when the prayer of Christ for the Church will be answered, and the Divine glory will once more begin to shine forth from it, so that all men will be drawn to Christ. And the spiritual unity of the Church, working always by spiritual means, may then be able to serve a world on the verge of ruin through its fears and divisions.

There are many things of wonderful beauty in the world that make a man thank God that he is alive. But there is one beauty that shines beyond all others :

Fair are the forests, fairer still the meadows
Clad in the shining robes of spring,
Jesus is fairer, Jesus is purer,
Jesus our Saviour, Friend, and King.

And He said of those who were to be His Church, ‘The glory that thou gavest me I have given them.’ Look at His Church as you have never looked at it before, until you see it as it was meant to be, the fellowship of those who are living the new splendid life of adventure for God under the protection and guidance of the Spirit, a fellowship by means of which He challenges all that is evil, gives liberation to the captive and friendship to the lonely, a fellowship of men and women who think nothing about their own glory, but always about His, so that without their knowing it their faces shine with the reflection of the glory that they see in Him.

TWENTY-FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Sacredness of Strength.

BY THE REVEREND J. G. GRANT FLEMING,
D.S.O., M.C., M.A., ABERDEEN.

‘This was the appearance of the likeness of the glory of the Lord. And when I saw it, I fell upon my face, and I heard a voice of one that spake. And he said unto me, Son of man, stand upon thy feet, and I will speak unto thee.’—Ezk 1st 2nd.

Our text comes at the close of an amazing description of a vision which came to the prophet Ezekiel as his call to serve God. Many words

are used by the prophet in an attempt to tell what he had seen—symbolic pictures that have little meaning for us to-day. But all his words and all his pictures merely illustrate his inability to describe the awfulness of the vision he had seen, and he closes on a simpler and more understandable note : ‘This was the appearance of the likeness of the Lord. And when I saw it, I fell upon my face.’ Whatever it was—the realization of a power, a presence, an overwhelming sense of holiness—it sent him to his knees in awe and reverence—‘I fell upon my face.’ But in the moments of utter prostration there dawned upon his soul a new assurance, the voice of God came to him saying, ‘Son of man, stand upon thy feet, and I will speak unto thee.’

The greatest of men—men like Moses, Isaiah, Ezekiel, St. Peter, St. Paul, and the saints of Christendom are humbled to the dust in awe when the sense of the presence of God dawns upon them ; but in the hour of reverence there comes a new power, a new dignity, new assurance, for the voice of God speaks, ‘Son of man, stand upon thy feet, I would speak with thee.’

Man still has his visions of God ; our minds go out to measure the universe ; we attempt to understand eternity ; we ponder on the mystery of life. Millions of words are written about our thoughts upon these things, but sometimes there comes a moment when man cannot write, when the magnitude and the wonder overwhelm and almost frighten him—when the mystery baffles him, the certainty of death crushes him, the insignificance and frailty of his own person bow him down ; and yet, somehow, out of the very heavens there comes a voice to the soul within, ‘Son of man, stand upon thy feet, for I would speak with thee.’ ‘You of all the creatures of My creating can comprehend the words I write in earth and heaven, stand upon thy feet and grapple with the mysteries of the universe—stand upon thy feet—thy God would speak with thee.’

Sometimes man’s moments of abasement come as this vision came to Ezekiel—as the vision came to St. Paul on the Damascus road—come as a result of a sense of unworthiness in the presence of the purity, the holiness, and the righteousness of God. The vision of the Heavenly Father portrayed in the life and Cross of Jesus Christ is so overwhelming that man is awed ; the wonder of such love claims his reverence, and in the knowledge of his own unworthiness his head is bowed in penitence and shame. The consciousness of sin and failure prostrates him before Almighty God, and yet again there seems to come a voice saying : ‘Son of man,

stand upon thy feet, I would speak with thee. Thou canst have the power to grapple with your failures, the grace to conquer sin, the possibility of new life now—Son of man, stand upon thy feet, I would speak with thee in Jesus Christ.'

Yes, it is true. Despite the vastness, the mystery, the amazing wonder of the universe which bends us low in awe; despite the consciousness of our sin and failure over against the holiness and righteousness of God, there is something within us—something greater than the universe—something greater than ourselves—something within us that calls us to our feet, to conquer our sinful natures and get the better of our failures to conquer the world for righteousness and truth, to grapple with the universe itself: 'Son of man, stand upon thy feet, thy God would speak with thee.' That is in itself a humbling thought—God calls the weakest of us to something great.

We come, week by week, into God's house to worship and adore. As we seek to live the Christian life, the meaning of the wondrous love of God portrayed in the life and Cross of Christ becomes clearer, and as we gaze at that Cross and think of that love, our own unworthiness and sin send us to the dust in awe and reverence, in penitence and shame, praying, 'God forgive us for our sin.' And in the hour of prostration there comes a voice, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee in Christ; lift thy head, stand upon thy feet, thy God would speak with thee.'

Yes, speak with thee, and the very first words are, 'Stand upon thy feet.' For the attitude of reverence, of penitence, of prostration, will only achieve that which is worth while if it is the prelude to a new beginning, if it means we rise again to new life for God. There is virtue in the dust if we lie not down in it; there is blessing in the humility that bows us down if we but bend to stand again; but it is possible to miss, in our penitence and prostration, the voice of God calling us to stand upon our feet.

I remember seeing a woman in India who travelled for over a hundred miles to some shrine, and each step of the way she measured her length in the dust. She seemed to have lost the sense of God in her prostrations. Sometimes the sense of sin, failure, insignificance, so overcome us that they fill our minds and keep us down, and we never rise above them. We repent in dust and in ashes, but it isn't the dust that is going to save us, it is the loving call of God. And God calls from above, not from below; look up—up at the Cross of My love, 'Stand upon thy feet, I have something to say to

thee.' And the same voice speaks to us of strength and of courage and wisdom and power to grapple with all the things in life that would bow us down.

Do you remember how the maniac of Gadarea wished to sit at Jesus' feet after Christ had cured him, but the Master bade him stand upon his own feet, and sent him back to his own people to tell the great things that had been done in him. Prostration is the first step in our understanding of God's purposes, but the second is rising to our feet and striving to fulfil His purposes for us. Have you ever thought of that? God has something great for us to do. He is calling us to something higher than we have ever yet achieved, to truth, to righteousness, to a finer manhood, a fairer womanhood, to service for our fellow-men. 'Son of man, stand upon thy feet, I would speak unto thee.'

Perhaps the vision of God has never come our way; the knowledge of God's love in Christ has never dawned upon our souls; perhaps we have not realized our own need. We shall achieve nothing worth while in the spiritual life until we have passed through this experience. Let us remember the presence of God in the world about us, let us think of the power of God in the universe, let us dwell on the wonder of the Heavenly Father's love in Christ. We cannot but bow our heads in reverence then. Then let us turn our thoughts for a moment honestly upon our sin, our need, our unworthiness. We will go right down on our knees then in penitence and shame. I have never met a man who could stand honestly in face of the holiness of God unless he had prostrated himself in the dust of repentance, and God had called him to his feet.

When we are sincere in our sorrow for sin, God does give us the power to arise; and He also enables us to make the new effort glorious. He will do it now as we bow before Him in worship and in prayer. We may fear at first, but the fear passes, for He gives us confidence to stand before Him. 'Son of man, stand upon thy feet, and I will speak with thee.'

In these moments of silence, let all our words of theorizing pass away; and let us prostrate ourselves before the Heavenly Father in reverence and humility; and we will hear Him say to us: 'Son of man, stand upon thy feet, I would speak with thee'—words of hope and courage, words of good news, words of salvation from sin and the promise of new life. And in receiving them may we answer with our lives until, having done all, we stand before Him at the last when the mysteries

of life will have been won through and we become perfect in His presence.

Then shall we stand upon our feet
In very deed, and gaze in wonder
Upon our Heavenly Father's face.

TWENTY-SECOND SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

On Winning the Lost.

'My sheep which was lost . . . the piece which I had lost . . . my son . . . was lost.'—*Lk 15^{6, 9, 24}*.

We would present these parables now as defining the obligation which rests upon Christ's disciples in union with Him to seek the lost. There is nothing plainer in the New Testament than the fact that He who came to seek and to save the lost still carries on that purpose through His disciples, in whom He dwells.

Christ gave these parables, not to sinners to convince them of their lostness, but to Pharisees and Scribes. These Pharisees were not consciously hypocrites, but men sincerely striving to preserve their personal sanctity. But they became so absorbed in externals that they actually came to that state in which they saw nothing in the really vital factors of any situation. Now the Lord Jesus hated Pharisaism just because He loved Pharisees—never forget that—and because He hoped and longed to save them from the unavoidable Nemesis of their own self-centredness. And He is not here speaking to them in irony when He calls them 'righteous' persons, 'just' persons. He says in effect to them, 'You have discovered your own need of relationship with God, and you have satisfied yourselves that by meticulous ritual observance that need is met. But you have lost sight of the fact that your mission in life concerns others who have not so found their need of definite relationship with God, and you are doing nothing to help them to find themselves. Your religion is altogether too self-centred, and on this account it has actually ceased to be religious.'

Now, first of all, we have the parable of the straying sheep; that is the parable of the thoughtless, those who yield to the herd instinct. They are like the one who, when asked, 'Where are you going?' replies, 'Nowhere in particular!' They are, in the main, heedless, restless, thoughtlessly keeping up with the throng, and bleating in unison its silly catch-phrases. They are mistaken, of course, and self-opinionated and pathetically self-satisfied. But they are of tremendous worth to the Shepherd!

We have given our young people laws enough, God knows. But have we ever sought to inspire them with enthusiasm for their true Leader? We have deplored—perhaps too publicly—their restlessness. Yet all the time we actually have the secret of which they are in quest. And were we filled with the Spirit of Jesus, doing the works that He did—ay, and greater works, as He promised we should—we should be impelled to go after them until we find common ground between our convictions and their yearnings.

Then there is the second group of lost ones. They are not a bit like sheep—not alert, restless, in almost perpetual motion; but rather are as insensible to their lost state as a coin that has fallen out of a woman's hand and rolled under a bed or a bureau. There are men who are exactly like coins out of circulation. They are making no contribution to life, for they are out of true relationship with God and with His will for which they were created. They are good enough when they are found and put into circulation. The metal is good; the image is there; the superscription has not been defaced. They just represent the ordinary folk, as like to each other as any one coin is like to another, who have got wrong ideas of life, who are selfish, narrow, self-contained and self-content. They are not doing harm to anyone, at any rate not wittingly. But they are altogether unaware that they were created for a life of serviceable fellowship with all God's other children, and that they are denying the very reason for their being. They have almost immeasurable potentialities for good or evil, as money, indeed, always has when it is in alliance with the great social forces of the world. But now, like the lost coin, they are useless. They are out of right relationship with God and life. They need to be convicted of the sin of living a life that is not increasing its dimensions, that is gaining nothing, that is accomplishing nothing in the world. They are apt to rely upon the fact that they are not influencing anybody for evil; that they are just living their own individual lives. We all of us know men who answer to this description; men who will only be saved if new thoughts of God's purpose, of life's value, and of ultimate morality in terms of individual responsibility, can be given to them. And it is well that we recognize that this will never be effected by exhortation, only by example.

Then, thirdly, Jesus said there are those who are like the younger son in the parable of the father and the two boys. He was lost, not because he went into the far country, nor because he became

a spendthrift rioter, but because he did not, while in the home, come 'to himself.' He did not come to a realization of his own nature and the purpose of his being. Riotous living was not his essential sin, nor were extravagance and impurity. These were rather just the outcome of his wrong ideas about his father and about his own life. It was quite evident, from what Jesus tells us of him, that he had dwelt on what was due to him rather than on what was due from him; until at last he broke out into a demand for the opportunity of self-realization, and left home. Had he invested his money and used it to give him power to exploit his fellows, or to gratify his senses, or to live comfortably until the soul within him died, he would still have been just as far from 'himself' as he was in the far country—perhaps farther.

His father let him go! He let him go because he knew that only by going could he fulfil himself; that only by cutting loose from the home control could he ever ultimately find himself. One cannot believe that Jesus intended to convey the lesson that the young should for ever stay at home! It was probably the best thing this young man could do to leave home. And when he ultimately 'came to himself,' when he got the new and true view-point of life, he was at once made conscious, not of the sin of riotous living, not of the sin of squandering his money. He became aware of his sin against heaven, and of the unworthy conduct which had become his record by his outrage of life's true purpose. In the days of his ignorance he said, 'Give me what is mine!' In the days of his awakening, 'Make me what I ought to be!'

There are all round about us people—and young people in particular—who are misunderstood and suspected, and who are in consequence bored with religion and uninterested in anything connected with it. Unspokenly, they crave sympathy, and seek after self-expression. They labour under the misconception that any idea of God is merely prohibitory of the desires of their nature. They have gone out to seek in a far country what they failed to find in their homes, and what they failed to find also in the Christian Church. One of the reasons for their failure is that there is too much 'Don't,' and not enough 'Do' in the average presentation of the Christian gospel.

Now, last of all, Jesus tells us about another son, representative of the fourth class of people who are lost all round about us. These are the lost people who are to be found in all the Christian churches, the adherents of all forms of organized religion. And they are typified by a man who was lost by the

sheer littleness and pettiness of the life in which he found contentment. If we look at his language we find it strangely familiar: 'I,' 'me,' and 'mine.' It is characteristic of a pitifully small mind without generosity or any thought beyond self. There is only one way to win such, who constitute quite the most obstinate and difficult case of the four classes here represented. Read again Christ's word: 'He would not go in. Therefore went his father out.'

It is quite impossible to say whether his father was successful with him. The inference is that he was not. But one thing is certain, that love and not indifference, long-suffering affection and not scorn, are the only forces that can break such an one down. And, thank God, they can.

Give me a faithful heart, likeness to Thee,
That each returning day henceforth may see
Some work of love begun, some deed of kindness
done,
Some wanderer sought and won, something for
Thee! ¹

TWENTY-THIRD SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Colonists of Heaven.

'For our conversation is in heaven.'—Ph 3²⁰.

Words, like people, have their ups and downs, and like people they have more downs than ups. Here in our text we have a word which has come down in the world. What the translators of three hundred years ago meant to convey by using 'Conversation' was that the place to which we belong is heaven. The Revised Version is nearer our modern English when it translates 'Our citizenship is in heaven,' meaning that the city, the country, the state to which we owe loyalty is heaven. Paul, the Roman citizen, never forgot his Roman citizenship, nor, once he became a Christian, did he forget his heavenly 'citizenship. You remember that Andrew Melville told James VI. of Scotland, 'There are two kingdoms in Scotland.' At the time of writing this Epistle, Paul was in Rome awaiting his trial. Looking out from his window on the great Mother City, he could not but remember the vast empire which she ruled over. Before his mind's eye there appeared the scattered outposts of Rome, in Britain and in Gaul, in Macedonia and Armenia, in Egypt and in Spain. In all these foreign lands the citizens of Rome were doing the work of the city, as pioneers, settlers, magistrates, soldiers.

¹ J. S. Holden, *The God-Lit Road*, 197.

With his mind coloured by this thought, he wrote these words to the Philippians: 'We are citizens of heaven.' What Roman citizens in lands far distant were doing for the Mother City, that the citizens of heaven were doing for the City of God. Dr. Moffatt brings out the full significance of our text when he gives the translation, 'For we are a colony of heaven.' Paul knew how the scattered Roman citizens were surrounded on the frontiers by aliens and enemies, their business and their pride to remain loyal to the Rome they had never seen. And so it was that the Philippians, the Ephesians, and all the rest, including Paul, and including ourselves, were the colony of heaven. We have never seen it. We are surrounded by aliens and enemies; it is our business and it should be our pride to remain loyal to the city that we have never seen, that city of God which has not known, and can never know, a decline and fall.

What does that loyalty involve? In the case of the Roman colonist, loyalty to Rome meant loyalty to Roman law. Every Roman colony and settlement lived, not according to the law of the indigenous inhabitants, but according to the law of the distant city. Paul had only to mention the fact that he was a Roman citizen to procure in Philippi itself his freedom from prison, and to secure his safety in Jerusalem when he was threatened by the mob. At its most distant borders, as at its centre, the Roman Empire was built on the majesty and the justice of Roman law. Christ's empire is built on a similar foundation. The law of Christ's kingdom is not native to this world. Whatever be the rules of life which govern the conduct of others in any land under the sun, these are not necessarily rules which should guide and control and govern Christians. Their loyalty is demanded to a higher law because they are colonists of heaven. Should it be the case that Rome expected and received from her absent exiled colonists what heaven cannot expect and does not receive from us? Rome, we may say, had blessings to confer; but is it not true that heaven also has blessings to confer? The whole of the laws of Christ's Kingdom are shot through and through with promises of blessing. These blessings are not, indeed, material, but they are blessings which time cannot take away and which are ours when time is no more.

There is no need to describe the lonely outposts in which loyalty to the laws of the city of God is demanded. We have only to remember that the world in which we live is not a world in which the majority of the people are pure in heart, or peace-makers, or humble, or merciful, or prefer righteous-

ness to profit. We have only to remember that, to realize that Paul's picture of the lonely outposts of heaven is as true to-day as ever it was.

There was something more than Roman law which was binding on Roman colonists, there was Roman tradition, there was the Roman spirit. No doubt there were renegades amongst the Roman colonists, but the tradition and spirit of their forefathers had a long and glorious lease of life in their successors. As late as the time when Rome itself was threatened by barbarians and had to call in her far-flung legions to defend her walls, that handful of Roman legionaries who were left in England, men who had never seen the city, were true to the old spirit and tradition. It was they who inscribed the tablet found on the Roman Wall, 'To the discipline of Augustus.' The spirit of the founders of the city breathes still in these simple words. Pompeii, as we know, was a city of unrestrained luxury and vice, so different from the old Roman sternness and simplicity, but it is in the city of Pompeii that we find our best-known example of loyalty to duty. A sentry stood at his post while Vesuvius was in eruption, and was buried alive at his post, erect in the ashes.

We are colonists of heaven. We, too, are inheritors of a tradition and a spirit. The writer of these words was at the building up of the tradition which we have inherited. He was among the first of a long Apostolic succession of men faithful to the spirit of Christ. What was that spirit? From the very beginning it was a spirit of service and self-sacrifice, it was a spirit which did not count the cost; it was a spirit which even in the darkest night believed that the day would dawn, and that the kingdoms of this world would become the kingdoms of God and of His Christ. That spirit and that tradition are preserved and active and potent still. The Church has not forgotten, and cannot forget, its past, the glory of its prophets and martyrs and missionaries. There are, of course, renegades; the spirit of the world creeps in in places; but in other places, perhaps in the obscurest corners of all, there are those who erect their tablets to the discipline—not of Augustus—but of Christ; there are men and women, unnamed and unnoticed, who realize that they are colonists of heaven, not merely to receive benefits but to fight battles and to defend frontiers and to extend these frontiers till the City of God shall rule over all. But we had best admit that if there were nothing more to hand on than some of us could hand on, the next generation would see the Church, not old, but dead, and most of the dearly bought territory over which

the flag of Christ had been raised by the toil and sacrifice of our fathers, surrendered.

For the Roman colonists there was not only the law, to which they were loyal, for the most part; there was not only the spirit and tradition of Rome, to which they were wonderfully loyal, for the most part; but there was Cæsar himself. The empire knew the value of that figure about whom it ultimately threw the cloak of a spurious divinity. As the empire grew old, more and more depended on the loyalty of the colonists to him; they were taught to worship him, and had he been worthy of such worship and such trust as he received, there is no saying what the course of history would have been—but he was not. We ourselves in our Empire know something of the value of that invisible bond of personal loyalty to the throne. It is almost the only bond that binds our dominions into one commonwealth.

The most important question of all is whether we are personally loyal to Jesus Christ, whether we have realized that the real bond is not between us and a city, but between us and Him. The real question is—How seriously do we take our oath of allegiance to Christ? The difficulty of keeping the law of Christ in this world is altogether too great; the tradition and spirit of Christ are far too high for us to maintain in these times, or in any times unless we are the servants and fellow-workers of a living Lord.¹

TWENTY-FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

A Sermon for Remembrance Day.

BY THE REVEREND STEWART MECHIE, M.A.,
EDINBURGH.

'And these all, having obtained a good report through faith, received not the promise: God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.'—He 11³⁹.

The roll of honour which is presented to us in this chapter contains a surprising variety of types. There are warriors like Gideon and Samson, national leaders like Moses and Samuel, prophetic figures of the ancient dispensation as well as a crowd of humble and heroic folk whose names are not recorded. Can we say they had anything in common? The writer to the Hebrews is in no doubt. To him they were all men of faith, men whose lives were dominated by a sense of the unseen realities, men who lived for ideals not for immediate gain, men who endured as seeing the invisible and counted life itself well lost in the service of the highest. As he

¹ E. D. Jarvis, *More Than Conquerors*, 97.

sums up in the flowing phrases of our text, we seem to catch three notes which resound afresh this Remembrance Day.

1. Disappointment.—'These all . . . received not the promise.'

Scarcely any of those to whom reference is made in this roll of honour were successful in realizing their aims. Most of them were failures, albeit glorious failures. They had great promises held out to them; they cherished lofty hopes and made strenuous endeavours; but all apparently in vain. Samson and Jeremiah, differing so widely, join hands in a common lot of failure. Abraham at the end of his life owned nothing in the promised land but a grave. Moses got no more of it than a distant prospect from the top of Pisgah. The prophets passed on without seeing the great day of their confident declarations. 'Received not the promise' might be the epitaph of them all.

Must we not say the same of the men whom we especially remember to-day? The bitterness of the disappointment lies not merely in the fact that they did not live to see the end of the War, but much more in that the ideals they strove for have not been realized. No doubt in this as in all things human there was some mixture of motives; but the best of them—yes, the most of them—were led into the War by devotion to ideal ends. In that sense we may hail those who appear on our rolls of honour equally with those who appear on the roll of honour of the ancient Jewish Church as men of faith. But what can we say of their ideal ends? Perhaps they might have known that disappointment was in store for them. Certainly the Church of Christ ought to have known. Our Lord told us that men do not gather grapes of thorns or figs of thistles. We might have guessed that modern war is not a plant likely to bear the peaceable fruit of righteousness. A war to end war, to uphold the sanctity of treaties, to crush militarism, to make the world safe for democracy—the very phrases have a cynical sound nowadays, for in these respects, one and all, the world is worse off now than it was before the War. The ends proposed by our men have not been realized. Their hopes have been bitterly disappointed. Whatever else we may dare to say of them, this at least is obvious and true—'received not the promise.'

2. Achievement.—'Having obtained a good report through faith.'

On the merely naturalistic or humanistic level there would be nothing more to add. 'Received

not the promise' would be the last word. But it is not the last word for us, as it is not the last word for the Bible. That God must be taken into account in all our judgments for He is the dominant factor in every situation, such is the invariable testimony of Scripture. So when the writer to the Hebrews brings God in, so to say, and reviews his roll of honour against the eternal background, disappointment fades away before the brightness of achievement. God is quick to mark men of faith and give them a good report. They have their certificate of character as faithful ones, and that can never be taken from them. If God is, then faith counts for something. To live for ideals under a sense of the unseen is an achievement in His sight, whatever the apparent ill-success. Further, if God is, the lives of such men are not lost. They are safe in His keeping, treasured up in some unseen realm. Yea more, if God is as He has declared Himself in Scripture, the effect of such lives is not wasted; it is a contribution to God's great ends, a little impulse which, under His ruling and overruling, may count surprisingly in the end of the day.

May we not say the same of those whom we remember to-day? He, unto whom all hearts are open, has seen all the good that we have seen in them and more. Their faith has gained them a good report, and we can be sure that they themselves are not cast as rubbish to the void. Through their faith they achieved something in God's sight; yes, and, by His overruling, their devoted life and death may yet achieve something in the sight of all men and in strange and indirect ways promote these high ends which at this moment seem more illusory than ever. On the merely human level disappointment and failure are the dominant notes, but on the level of Biblical faith it is otherwise. By confident trust in the unseen realities, by seeing God in our situation and resolutely persisting in seeing Him there, we, too, like the writer to the Hebrews, may well hear achievement sound more loudly than disappointment this Remembrance Day. We may the more surely do that in view of the remainder of our text.

3. Postponement.—'God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.'

The writer to the Hebrews is no individualist. In his view the final goal of God's purpose is not an aggregation of individual perfections, but a perfected organism, a corporate entity, a body with many members, a temple in which each soul is a

living stone. That is the consummation which all the New Testament sets before us—the family life of the Eternal Father and His redeemed children—and not till all are gathered in is it perfected. Till then there is something lacking to the bliss of the saints. True, we cannot speak of the consummation exactly as this writer does. He is expecting the end of the age and the final coming of the Lord very soon, and that expectation puts the emphasis where we can hardly put it. He tells his readers that something better is provided for them than for the heroes of the Old Testament, not in the sense that they will receive a better salvation than the faithful ones of old, but in the sense that their case is better, since they live in the Christian dispensation and the interval of waiting till the consummation is for them so very brief. We to-day, still awaiting the full coming of the Kingdom in power, are more impressed by the delay than this writer was, but we can join with him in the assurance that our lives and the lives of all the faithful departed of all the ages are part of one great movement. They, whether of the old dispensation or of the new, without us are not made perfect. There is something lacking to them, something that shall yet be made up, for God's purposes cannot be defeated. The ideals of men, in so far as they are His will, are not frustrated but merely deferred. Far from admitting that faithful lives are futile, since faith seems to bring them nothing more substantial than a certificate of character, this writer calls to his readers to hold fast their faith. The men of old have not lost their full reward, they are merely kept waiting. The full triumph of God's purpose is only postponed and their part in it is sure.

May we not again recall the men who fell in the War? They, too, are in the one great movement of Divine activity with us and those who went before us and those who may come after us. They cannot attain full blessedness apart from us. The realization of their ideals, so far as these were God-inspired, is not defeated but merely postponed. That means that we have our battle to fight. The best tribute we can pay them, the best service we can render them, is to carry on their fight of faith. We, too, must live for ideal ends, not for present or personal gain; we, too, must strive and endure as seeing the invisible. So shall we receive a good report through faith and gain our lives in losing them.

We must not, however, slavishly follow those who went before, but must listen to hear what the Lord will speak to ourselves. Samson and Gideon

as men of faith were different in their actions from Isaiah and Jeremiah. Our men fought. It may be that God will call us not to fight. It may be that our war is rather against the root causes of war. Have we, for instance, sufficiently applied our minds and our wills to the internal economic frustrations, afflicting every country, for which war often seems the only or the easiest safety-valve? Here surely is a warfare more subtle and not less exacting. Not the method of our brethren's warfare necessarily, but the faith, the purpose, the completeness of devotion, these we must follow as God gives us

guidance. As it is to Him we look for victory, so it must be to Him we look for light as to the manner of our warfare and the part of the struggle He has committed unto us. The blessedness of the faithful of all the ages and our blessedness, too, will lack completeness till that something better than He has provided is fully revealed and the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our God and His Christ. The promise still stands. If we give up in despair we shall be traitors to our brethren, traitors to the faithful of all the ages, traitors to our God.

Ecclesiasticus: A New Fragment of the Hebrew Text.

BY G. R. DRIVER, M.A., OXFORD.

MR. JOSEPH MARCUS has recently discovered and published a new fragment of the original Hebrew text of the 'Wisdom of Jesus ben Sirach,' under the title of *The Newly Discovered Original Hebrew of Ben Sira* (*Ecclesiasticus* xxxii. 16-xxxiv. 1), and he is much to be congratulated on the skill with which he has accomplished his task in view of the deplorable state of the manuscript (called E) which the facsimile betrays. The purpose of these notes, then, is to suggest alternative readings or interpretations of the text in seven passages where the editor seems to have gone astray.

32¹⁹: [בלא עצה אל] תפעל דבר ואחר מעשיך אל תחקפץ.

Such is the reading of E (restored at the beginning of the verse from B), and Marcus suggests that אל תחקפץ is a scribal error for אל תחקצה 'vex not thyself,' which is the reading of B; for he knows of no Hebrew אחקפץ suitable to the context. It may, however, be explained from the Syr. *qpas*¹ Pe. 'drew back' (especially the hands, as in the Pesh. in 2 S 24¹⁶=1 Ch 21¹⁵), and Ethpa. 'drew oneself back, shrank' (e.g. Syr. Aq. in Ps 32=33⁸); thus the verse may be translated:

'Do nothing imprudently, and after thy deed draw not back.'²

¹ Cf. Brockelmann, *G.V.G.S.S.* i. § 88, for Hebrew שָׁחַף =Syr. *s*.

² Cf. 4²² (D) and 4²¹ (A), where again שָׁחַף occurs, in both places with various readings which suggest ignorance or misunderstanding of a rare word; but *difficilior lectio potior*.

i.e. be prudent in everything and finish whatever you begin.

33²: ומתמוטט כמסערה אנוני. If the nonsensical אנוני is corrected to אנוי = אֲנוּי³ 'vessel,' as Margolis suggests after the Gk. version, the meaning of the phrase is 'and tossed about as a ship by a storm' (cf. Gk. $\text{ὡς ἐν καταίγιδι πλοίου}$); clearly כִּמְסַעֲרָה is an instance of the rare retention of another preposition after 'כ' 'like.'⁴ If, then, this explanation of E's כִּמְסַעֲרָה is right, it follows that B's כִּמְסַעֲרָה is an error for כִּמְסַעֲרָה, which must be read כִּמְסַעֲרָה, and not כִּמְסַעֲרָה, as Peters vocalizes it; thus the un-Hebraic כִּמְסַעֲרָה disappears from the language.

33⁴: [הכן דבריך ואחר תעשה] ובית מנו ואחר תניח. Marcus translates this verse, 'prepare thy words, and then shalt thou do; build a resting-place, and then shalt thou go forth (?),' reading בנה for בית. The first half of the verse is clearly rightly so rendered, but his version of the second half scarcely makes sense; at the same time it seems impossible to bring the Greek translator's $\text{σύνδεσμον παιδείαν καὶ ἀποκριθῆναι}$ into relation with the Hebrew text, even though ויאחו את־הבית is oddly enough translated $\text{σύνδεσμον τὸν σύνδεσμον}$ by the LXX (1=3 K 6¹⁰), as Marcus rightly observes. The Hebrew text can only mean:

'Prepare thy words, and afterwards thou shalt act; And pass the night in rest, and afterwards thou shalt be bright';

³ Cf. דָּנוּי = דָּנוּי (44¹⁹, in margin).

⁴ Cf. Kautzsch-Cowley, *Hebr. Gramm.*, 376^a.

in other words, careful preparation of one's words paves the way for successful action, proper rest ensures a fresh outlook on the problems of life. I take בִּית as the imperative of a Hebrew בָּתָּה, identical with the Aram.-Syr. בָּתָּה 'passed the night,'¹ and כְּנִיחָ, as in the accus. case describing state or place; then I take הַתִּיבָה as the Hi. of נִיבָה 'was bright,' used metaphorically (cf. הִבְלִי).

[מה . . . יום כי בלו אור שונה מעל שמש: 33⁷.

So Marcus reads the text without attempting to fill the gap in the first half, for which the Greek translator has διὰ τὴν ἡμέραν ἡμέρας ὑπερέχει, showing clearly that the Hebrew text lacks a verb. The

Greek ὑπερέχειν, 'to excel,' is used by the LXX for, amongst other things, the Hebrew אֲדִיר 'splendid' and גָּדוֹל 'great,' and also for the Aramaic שָׁנָא 'excelled.'² In the second half שֹׁנָה, which Marcus leaves untranslated, is the participle of a Hebrew שָׁנָה, which may be identified with the Arab. *sanâ*, 'shone brightly, flashed,' and the Eth. *sanaya*, 'was beautiful,' and is from the same root as the Acc. *šinilu*, 'dyed cloth,' and the Hebrew שָׁנִי 'scarlet.' This שֹׁנָה 'was bright' and שָׁנָה 'was exalted' are in all probability at bottom identical roots; yet, as Jesus ben Sirā has no hesitation in using the same root in both halves of a verse,³ the original text may be confidently conjectured to have been:

אור שונה מעל שמש

[מה ישנה מיום כי בלו]

'how is one day more excellent' or 'brighter than another, when altogether it is bright from upon,' i.e. 'draws its brightness from, the sun?'

in other words, how can one day excel another when all derive their brightness from the same source?

[כן האדם ביד] עושהו להתיצב מפניו חלק: 33¹³.

Marcus translates this verse, 'so is a man in the hand of his Maker; he apportioned him to stand before Him (P),' following the Greek translator's οὕτως ἄνθρωποι ἐν χειρὶ τοῦ ποιήσαντος αὐτοὺς ἀποδοῦναι αὐτοῖς κατὰ τὴν κρίσιν αὐτοῦ. I suggest, however, that the Hebrew חֶלֶק has here the sense subsequently developed as normal in the Arab. *ḥalāqa* 'created,' which is preferable in the context. This use of the same verb is found again in several passages of this book, where, too, it has the support of the Greek translator—certainly in 31¹³ (חֶלֶק = ἐκτίσται), 31²⁷ (נֶחֱלֶק = ἐκτίσται) and 38¹ (חֶלֶק = ἐκτίσεν), and possibly in 39²⁵ and 40¹ (חֶלֶק = ἐκτίσται); in the first three passages this meaning is necessary, in the last two it is perhaps not so likely as that usually borne by the Hebrew verb but still conceivable.⁴

¹ Also Bab. *bātu* (=Ass. *bādū*) 'to pass the night.'

² In Dn 7²³, where the LXX rightly render חֲשַׁנּוּ by ἡνὶς ὑπερέχει πάσας τὰς βασιλείας 'which shall excel all the kingdoms.' Professor Thomas (in *Z. At. W.*, lii. 236-8) has shown that the Hebrew שָׁנָה has a similar meaning in Pr 24²¹,²² and Est 2⁹, being cognate with the Arab. *saniya* 'was exalted,' with which also the Syr. *šan(n)ā* 'sublimity,' is connected; and in a private letter he adds Pr 5⁹, where שֹׁנָה is parallel to חֹדֶד 'thy majesty' to these passages.

³ E.g. 3²³ 4² 8¹³. 13 11²⁷ 37¹ 40⁴ 41¹³ 45²⁵.

⁴ Nöldeke (in *Z. At. W.*, xx. 85-6) says that the development of the meanings of the חֶלֶק is from

[על וע]בות חומר חומכו: 33²⁷.

The Greek translator's ζυγὸς καὶ ἱμᾶς τράχηλον κάμψουσιν 'yoke and thong will bow the neck' evidently preserves approximately the true sense. Further, the form of the sentence, especially in the absence of a conjunction before חומר, shows that this cannot be חֶסֶד 'rod, stick,' standing parallel with עֲבוֹת and עֲבוֹת and so denoting a third form of punishment, as Marcus takes it, but must be the predicate to them; it can then only be a participle vocalized חוֹסֵר, standing in the sing. number with a plur. subject⁵ and governing the following חומכו as its subject. It does not seem possible to discover a Hebrew חטר meaning 'bowed' or the like, but there appears to be some possibility of some such meaning as 'galled.' In fact, this line of investigation suggests two possibilities. First, there is a verb of this form in the Aram. *ḥāṣar* 'fenced in, beat, scraped' and the Syr. *ḥṣar* 'carded,' both derived from *ḥūtrā* 'twig, rod, staff'; but, although such a secondary sense may well have been developed in a Hebrew חטר, the meaning is perhaps not quite appropriate to the picture. Second,

dividing or apportioning to appointing or ordaining and thence to creating, which however is not quite reached in Hebrew usage (although the Greek translator employs κτίζειν for it), and that it cannot therefore be regarded as an Arabism in this book. Smend (*Die Weisheit des Jesus Sirach erklärt*, ii. 277-8) says that the sense of creating is derived rather from that of polishing or working into shape (as it is in the בָּרָא) than from that of dividing or apportioning.

⁵ Cf. שָׁנָה וקפתו ישמחלב. (Pr 27⁹).

there is a Syr. *hrat*, 'cut, scratched' (cf. Arab. *haraṭa* 'scraped,' 'peeled'), with which it may be *per metathesim* cognate,¹ if indeed חורט is not an error of transposition for חורט.² Then הוּכְר (i.e. הִכְר) must refer to the part of the body, either the neck or shoulders or else the skin, which the rope and the yoke thus injure, and the only possible explanation of it which I can suggest is that it is the same word as the Acc. *tikku* 'neck.'³ Thus חוּכְר וְעִבּוּר חוּכְר may be translated, at any rate provisionally, 'yoke and rope gall his neck,'

¹ Metathesis in roots containing a sonant and a palatal is well attested (see Brockelmann, *G.V.G.S.S.*, i. § 98 c e, g¹ ð).

² Cf. 33¹⁸ for such a mistake on the part of the copyist of this MS. (עמל for עלמ).

³ Acc. *haššu(m)* = *hanšu(m)* = *hamšu(m)* = Hebrew חֲפִישׁ 'fifth,' and Acc. *ihku(m)* = Syr. *hek(k)ā* = Arab. *hanaku(m)* 'gum' illustrate the assimilation here postulated in the Accadian as compared with the Hebrew word.

which makes perfectly good sense in the context.

כִּי בַמִּשָּׁפ . . . 33³¹

With a powerful magnifying-glass I can with a fair degree of certainty make out . . . כִּי בַמִּשָּׁפ, which corresponds nicely with the Greek translator's *οὐδ' ὅς ἡ ψυχὴ σου ἐπιδοξάσεις αὐτῷ* (though in the next verse, as the clauses are here interchanged in the Hebrew and Greek texts), so far as it goes.

The interpretations of these seven passages here suggested rest in seven cases on the application of the principles of comparative philology to problems of lexicography (חֲפִישׁ, מְנוּחַ, בֵּית, נֶגַה, שֹׁנָה, חֶלֶק, חוּכְר), once on the true vocalization of a word (כִּי בַמִּשָּׁפ), once on a different reading (בַּמִּשָּׁפ), and once on a conjectural restoration (יִשְׁנָה) of the Hebrew text, and they are put forward in the hope of explaining the text without having recourse to emendation.

Ought We to Consider the Consequences?

BY THE REVEREND A. GORDON JAMES, LYTHAM ST. ANNES, LANCASHIRE.

IN estimating the moral worth of any action, to what extent is it necessary to take into account the possible consequences that may follow? This is a question which all thinking men are bound to consider, but to which many of us avoid giving a direct answer, either because we assume that the answer is generally known and accepted, or because not having thought the matter through, we have no answer to give. An effective example of the way in which this particular issue is evaded is plainly seen in the controversy that is raging in respect to what is known as Christian Pacifism. Almost every argument on both sides of the subject under discussion has been worn threadbare. Yet no serious attempt has been made by the Pacifist to justify, on intellectual grounds, his contention that war being unchristian, he is compelled to renounce it, *whatever the consequences to himself or to others*. On the other hand, those who assert that things being as they are, the Christian cannot renounce war *lest the consequences bring disaster*, are content to leave the matter there, without any explanation as to why they find it necessary to consider the consequences at all. Yet surely, this is the one point of difference between the 'Christian' Pacifist and the 'Christian' non-Pacifist. This is

the ground of their disagreement. They cannot afford, therefore, to disregard the serious problem which lies at the root of their difficulties.

Every volitional action has to be considered from two points of view. First, is it right? That is to say, is it in harmony with an agreed standard? As the ethical student would ask, is it according to rule? Second, is the action good? That is to say, is it in harmony with that supreme and ultimate end to which life is or ought to be directed? If we were dealing with all actions of every kind it would be necessary to discuss the validity of our standards and the nature of the *Summum Bonum*, which is the end we have in view. We should be required, further, to enquire whether there is one ultimate end, or whether men can be satisfied with a diversity of aims, not all of them related to one another. For our present purpose, however, it will be sufficient if we move within the range of ideas that are specifically Christian and thus limit our investigation to those actions that are wrought with a Christian intention and governed by a Christian motive. Right conduct, therefore, may be defined as conduct which is in accord with the teaching and spirit of Jesus Christ, who constitutes the standard for all Christian people. The ultimate end may be summed

up in the phrase 'the Kingdom of God,' which is the supreme good for all those who acknowledge the authority of our Lord. If it be objected that both the Christian standard and the Christian end need further definition and explication, it will be sufficient to reply that all that is necessary for the present argument is the acknowledgment of the fact; namely, that for the Christian, the final authority is in Christ and the ultimate end of all living is the reign of God.

Here it is necessary to distinguish between two classes of action for which the individual can be held responsible. The first may be called personal action, that is, action which a man takes on his own behalf, in response to what he believes to be right and to serve an end which he believes to be good. It is true that others may be affected by what he does, but he does not act primarily on their behest or at their bidding. He exercises his freedom of choice between right and wrong, between good and evil, for himself and himself alone. The second class may be called trustee action, that is, action which a man takes on behalf of others. He may be a member of Parliament, responsible to his constituents, or the director of a company, responsible to his shareholders. In such event, he will consider, not merely what is right or good for himself, but whether he is acting in the best interests of those who have reposed their confidence in him for certain well-understood reasons. Even if they have allowed him complete freedom of action, he is still bound in honour to consider their wishes so far as he knows them; and his choice will be limited in that respect. There is a sense in which we are all trustees, for no man liveth to himself and we are bound together by mutual obligation. But the distinction between personal and trustee action is none the less real; and in practice it is an important factor in the regulation of conduct and must be borne in mind in criticising the actions of others.

So far as the consequences of any action are concerned, one further distinction must be made, namely, between consequences that are immediate and apparent and consequences that are remote and not always apparent. The immediate consequences of a refusal to bear arms at a time of war, for example, may be imprisonment for the individual, or, if there are many such cases, national defeat and humiliation. The remote consequences are more difficult to estimate and therefore more open to conjecture. Some will urge that international disarmament will result, others that the world will revert to barbarism. We are now moving in a world of prophecy, or, as some would

say, of speculation. There can be no certainty, save that of faith, which rests, not upon the knowledge of the way events will move, but upon what we believe to be the character of God.

We are now in a position to consider a particular action. The factors to be taken into account are: (1) Is it right, that is, is it in accord with the Christian standard? (2) Is it good, that is, is it directed towards the establishment of the Kingdom of God? (3) Is it my own personal act, or have I to pay regard to the wishes of others? (4) What are the probable consequences? If we can find satisfactory answers to these questions we are able to estimate the ethical value of the action. But it is clear that the questions are not of equal importance: they do not all stand on the same level. They should therefore be taken in order, each factor falling into its proper place, otherwise the final result is likely to be incorrect.

If the answer to the first question is 'No,' then there is no point in proceeding further, for any action not in accord with the Christian standard must by the Christian be condemned, even though it have a good end in view or be a trustee rather than a personal act. This rules out the maxim that it is sometimes prudent to do evil that good may result, which may be worldly wisdom but is certainly a violation, not only of Christian principle but of ethical rectitude. It also rules out the specious plea that what is right for the individual may be wrong for the community or vice versa; for a trustee can never act on behalf of others on a lower level of morality than he would act for himself, without affronting Christian standards. A negative answer to the question, 'Is it right,' therefore, settles the matter once and for all and whether or not the consequences are likely to be agreeable does not arise.

On the other hand, if the answer to this question is 'Yes,' or even 'I do not know,' we have then to proceed to the second, 'Is it good?' Again, a negative reply is decisive, for the Christian cannot act in disloyalty to the purpose of God, which is the coming of His Kingdom. An uncertain answer to questions one and two will also be decisive, on the ground that the Christian is never left entirely in the dark, but relies upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit. If this guidance is not forthcoming, if he does not know whether any proposed action is right or good, he will naturally pause.

The third question is not so difficult as it appears. A trustee is a person in whom others repose trust. If he acts against what he believes to be right and good, he violates that trust, even though his con-

stituents may not concur with his judgment. In this event, he has no option but to resign his position and pass over its responsibilities to another. To argue that one is compelled to adopt a lower standard of ethics in the capacity of a trustee than in matters of personal conduct is to violate the conditions of trusteeship. If this were always recognized, a great many practical difficulties would be avoided.

Finally, we come to the question of consequences. Assuming that an action is judged right and good, that is, in harmony with the Christian standard and directed towards the establishment of the Kingdom of God, but that its immediate consequences are likely to be painful to the individual and embarrassing to the community, whilst its more remote consequences cannot be accurately discerned, to what extent should they be taken into account? So far as the individual Christian is concerned, the answer is clear and unambiguous. He must never be deterred from doing his duty, whatever the cost to himself. His loyalty to Christ demands that he should deny himself, take up his cross and follow his Lord. If his action is likely to cause pain to others, he must satisfy himself, not merely by reference to his own conscience, but by diligent examination of his standards and by due regard to the counsels of the Church, that he is forming a correct judgment under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. When he is satisfied on these points, he must risk hurting his friends and neighbours or causing annoyance to the community. It was in relation to circumstances of this order that Jesus said, 'I came not to send peace, but a sword,' a text that is sorely misunderstood and misapplied. As for the remote consequences, these lie within the will of God, and we must be content to leave them there.

The application of these principles to particular cases need not detain us. That they have a bearing

upon the controversy between Pacifism and its opponents is obvious. But by keeping strictly within the range of Christian ideas and by proceeding cautiously step by step, it ought not to be impossible to arrive at definite conclusions. When these conclusions are reached, the individual Christian will know how to act upon them and the Church will be more wisely instructed. At present we are all exposed to moods of feeling which lack a rational background. Our safety lies in a close examination, not merely of personal motive, but of the standards of our faith and the end we have in view. The question of consequences will then be put into its right perspective and we shall see our way more clearly.

There remains one objection to what has been stated above, and this cannot be ignored, though it is not possible to deal with it fully within the limited scope of this article. It may be urged that action, whether individual or corporate, is never rational, but is the result of deep-seated instincts of which we are never fully conscious. We act first, and rationalize afterwards. This may be true; indeed, it is true. But we are entitled to examine our conduct, and, so far as we are able, to establish it upon principle. We must not assume that psychology has driven ethics completely off the field. The two must be correlated and within the sphere of Christianity they can be. Is it too much to say that when we have established our principles we can afford to leave our instincts to take care of themselves? If the psychologist objects to so sweeping a generalization, at least we may respectfully remind him that there are other sciences besides his own, and that a true philosophy of life must embrace them all. At any rate, it will do us no harm to base our conduct upon the principles of revealed religion. If we go astray, the fault will not be in our stars, but in ourselves.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Christianity and the Political Order.¹

THIS very large book is a sequel to the author's *Evangelische Wirtschaftsethik*, which was published

¹ *Evangelische Ethik des Politischen*, by Georg Wünsch, Professor der systematischen Theologie in Marburg (Mohr, Tübingen; 1936).

nearly ten years ago. The present volume was not specially written in view of the recent Oxford Conference on Life and Work, but is offered as a German contribution to the discussion of such problems. The English reader finds much in it that is already accessible in English, and a curious indifference to some of the important writing by

English experts on State and Church; Mr. Lloyd George is once mentioned, but there is not any suggestion of acquaintance with Dr. Figgis, the brothers Carlyle, Maitland, Creighton, or Dean Inge. However, Professor Wünsch is writing for his own people, and, if one makes allowance for the somewhat provincial outlook upon a central theme, his survey becomes useful even to foreign readers at more points than one.

Attaching himself to Luther, whom he reproduces with critical sympathy, the author begins with an introductory section, which posits the Kingdom of God as vitally connected with faith in the order of Creation; his brief discussion of the Sermon on the Mount argues this forcibly against the Marcionitism of Tolstoi and later theorists. The second section (pp. 92-370) is an historical sketch, mainly for Germans, of the Church and State problem from the Reformation to Frederick the Great, Bismarck, and the present régime, with side-glances at sects like the Quakers and Levellers in seventeenth-century England. Here Professor Wünsch is not bound to the chariot wheels of Troeltsch, fortunately; his analyses are independent and sometimes pungent. The third section (pp. 371-655), which is the heart of the treatise, discusses factors like race, nationality, and economic questions in their relation to religion, the purpose being to justify Nazi Socialism as politically inevitable no less than fruitful, with just freedom for evangelic Christianity of a courageous patriotic type to breathe. National Socialism, he significantly remarks, seeks the national unity on a positively religious basis, but on no confessional basis (p. 652). The implicit or, indeed, the explicit theism of the régime represents a 'God who is the source of confidence for the political man. . . . And this faith is the faith of the first article in Christianity, the faith of trust in God, the Lutheran, reforming faith,' which inspired Cromwell, Schleiermacher, and Frederick the Great. The apologia is worked out neatly, prudently, and with learning.

To such a large volume a more adequate index than eleven pages of names and subjects ought to have been attached, for the book is one to which the reader will refer for certain discussions, to which the contents afford no clue.

Two fresh contributions to the *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*¹ have appeared. Professor Galling has completed the serviceable lexicon which has

been already noted in our pages. It manages to furnish the reader with the essential data on topography and archaeology in short articles, some of which are aptly illustrated; the article on 'sarco-phagus' in this part is an excellent specimen of the compressed but instructive workmanship which the editor has succeeded in putting into his manual.

The Dutch scholar, Dr. Gemser, now at the University of Pretoria, has edited the Book of Proverbs for the *Handbuch*. The opening collection (1-9) is placed between the great prophets and the age of Ezra; the Solomon collection (10-22¹⁶) and the 'Hezekiah' edition of Proverbs in 25-29, which originally were independent, are older; of the appended collections, that in 22¹⁷-24²² has used the Egyptian Amen-em-ope maxims, though Israel's wisdom is pronounced to be less intellectual and more ethical than Egypt's. The book is thorough and concise, with more attention paid to the etymology than to the ethics of the Proverbs, upon the whole. But Dr. Gemser sometimes remembers interpretation in the midst of his philology. Thus he has a word to say on 'surely in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird'; the point is, that a silly bird will entangle itself in a net lying before its very eyes, as a sinner against his better knowledge lets himself be mixed up with evil company to his own ruin. JAMES MOFFATT.

New York.

The Faith and Order Conference.

IN connexion with the Faith and Order Conference in Edinburgh in August four Commissions had been preparing material for discussion. One has dealt with the relation of the Church and Revelation. This volume² has been prepared to accompany the Report, and deals in a selection of essays with the subjects there discussed. A wide view is taken of the subject; and Ministry, Apostolic Succession, and the Sacraments are included. In the first part the method of study is discussed, and a general survey is given; in the second special researches are offered in German, French, and English. The English contributor seeks to relate the theory of the Apostolic Succession to the essence of the gospel; the German contributor seeks to prove that the relation of the Apostles to the Lord was personal, and could not be transferred.

² *Die Kirche Jesu Christi und das Wort Gottes; Ein Studienbuch über das Wort Gottes als Lebensgrund und Lebensform der Kirche*, herausgegeben von D. Wilhelm Zöllner und D. Dr. Wilhelm Stählin (Furche Verlag, Berlin, 1937).

¹ *Biblisches Reallexikon*, Bögen 11-18, und Titelbögen, von Kurt Galling; and *Sprüche Salomes*, von B. Gemser (Mohr, Tübingen; M.3.45).

A Protestant contributes as objective a study as possible of the Roman Catholic position. The Orthodox is also stated. The longest contribution deals with Calvin. While the ultimate authority of the Word of God, God's self-revealing activity, not confined to the Scriptures, is insisted on, verbal inspiration is expressly repudiated by several of the writers. But there are a few allusions which seem to assume that the early stories in Genesis are authentic history. What one does regret is that this volume indicates that most of the writers desire to 'stay put' in their denominational position, and are not endeavouring to find the common witness to the world of a united Church, one in the Word of God.

In the *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuse*, Professor Bernard Ménégos of Strasbourg University writes a most interesting article on 'Résurrection.' It is a plea for a theology, for which the Resurrection is central and determinative. He first of all discusses the relation of faith in the Resurrection to historical and then to physical science, and insists that the Resurrection belongs to a supra-historical and a supra-natural order, and can neither be explained nor denied by them. The record, which belongs to 'the three-storey cosmology,' is to be taken symbolically, and an increasing materialization in the tradition must be recognized. Having justified against these objections the faith in the Resurrection, Professor Ménégos discusses its relation to theology. He contrasts the theology which gives full significance to the Resurrection—the *divine dynamic* through the Risen Lord in present human experience—with the theology which looks back to the earthly ministry, and the theology which looks forward to the end. I may add that I find myself in close agreement with this point of view, and commend it for serious consideration.

In the same journal (pp. 196-209) appears an article by another Strasbourg teacher, Jean Hering, on 'Kyros Anthropos,' in which he discusses the Jewish conception of the Heavenly Man, or Second Adam in Ro 5¹²⁻²¹, and in 1 Co 15⁴⁵⁻⁴⁹. He contends that Hebrew usage allows the rendering of *εἰς* as equivalent to *δευτερος*. He finds the same conception in Ph 2⁶⁻¹¹, a hymn in strophes of three lines each, and full of Aramaisms according to Lohmeyer. He contends that *μορφῇ* may be rendered *image*, as there is evidence of the equivalence of *μορφῇ* and *εἰκὼν* as renderings of the Aramaic *demoutha* or *tsalma*. The Second Adam bears the divine image as does the first, but this does not mean equality with God, as many theologians have taken the word *μορφῇ* to involve. Accordingly, the meaning of the passage is given as follows. 'The heavenly pre-existent Adam could have conceived the senseless project of seizing by force the equality with God which he did not yet possess. Instead of that, he humbled himself, and it is this which made possible both his redemptive work, and his elevation after death' (pp. 201 f.). The last words of v. 8, 'the death of the cross,' have been added by Paul, as they do not fit into the framework of the strophe. The heavenly is thus contrasted with the earthly Adam who fell before the temptation of the promise, 'ye shall be as God.' The exaltation won by the humiliation was the Lordship which in 1 Co 15²⁴⁻²⁸ is declared to be temporary. If this interpretation is correct, it will deliver Christology from a number of *Kenotic* theories, which Ritschl rightly described as mythology. I have never been able to use this passage as it has often been used. Limits of space here forbid my discussing what value this conception of the Heavenly Man can have for Christian dogmatics. I have been inclined to regard it as a mere myth.

A. E. GARVIE.

London.

Contributions and Comments.

'Let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the publican' (Mt. xviii. 17).

THESE words (in Moffatt, 'Treat him as a pagan or a taxgatherer') form the concluding injunction of a

passage giving directions for the treatment of a 'brother' or fellow-Christian who has fallen into sin. The usual explanation is that, if the offending brother will not listen either to your own remonstrance or to the authoritative rebuke of the Chris-

tian congregation, your duty is to treat him as outside the pale of Christian fellowship—to break off intercourse with him. To many to-day such an interpretation appears profoundly unsatisfactory and inconsistent with the usual teaching and practice of Jesus. If a mere Jewish rabbi had been speaking, they would indeed be probable. But Jesus is represented as using words of almost uniform respect and commendation in His references to *Gentiles*, implying clearly that they were nearer to the Kingdom than were the Jews. He chose Gentile-infected Galilee as the scene of His works of healing, and had especial blessings for the Samaritan and the Roman centurion. As regards the hated *tax-gatherers*, far from holding no intercourse with them, we know how, in defiance of Jewish custom, He habitually took His meals with them.

What, then, do these words mean? I suggest that the true interpretation is to be found in Mt 5⁴³⁻⁴⁸, the passage giving the Christian expansion of the old precept to love one's neighbour as oneself. As far as I can discover, this is the only other place in the Gospels or indeed in the New Testament, where 'tax-gatherers' and 'Gentiles' are brought into any kind of juxtaposition. This indicates at any rate a presumption that this portion of the great Sermon may throw light on Mt 18¹⁷. Let us consider why Gentile and tax-gatherer are introduced into a passage of which the cardinal words are the new command to 'love your enemies and pray for your persecutors' (5⁴⁴). After 5⁴⁵, from which we gather that God has loving care over 'enemies' and 'persecutors' and that these classes of people may be otherwise described as 'wicked' and 'unjust,' we come to two pairs of questions which are clearly meant to furnish commentaries on the above-mentioned command to love and pray for enemies and persecutors.

To the English reader the point of v. 47 is nearly lost by the usual rendering 'salute your brethren.' The two Hebrew words usually employed to express salutation literally mean 'bless' and 'ask for the peace of' respectively; and in the East, then as now, a salutation either verbally or implicitly contains a prayer for the person addressed—a recommendation of him to the Divine care. This salutation of peace would not be conferred by a strict Jew upon a Samaritan or other Gentile; nor would a Samaritan (say) confer it usually upon a Jew. So Mt 5⁴⁷ would gain immensely in point (in relation to the rest of the passage) if we translated, 'And if you pray only for the peace of your brethren.' Further, in the quotation from Leviticus

in v. 43, the primary sense of 'neighbour' (as opposed to 'enemy') is almost certainly 'fellow-Jew.' It is therefore probable that the 'brethren' of v. 47 also means primarily 'fellow-Jews.'

This rendering makes the close connexion of vv. 46, 47 with v. 44 quite obvious. The effect of the four questions is an injunction to love those who do not love us, so that we may rise above the level of the tax-gatherer, who had no love for his victims, coupled with another to pray for those who are alien to our race and religion, so doing better than the Gentile who would not pray for the Jew. But why these special references to tax-gatherers and Gentiles? Surely because the words are merely variants to the 'enemies' and 'persecutors' whom we are told in v. 44 to love and pray for. To a Jew 'Gentile' and 'enemy' were almost synonymous terms, and the exaction and cruelty of the tax-gatherer is not unfitly described as a kind of 'persecution.' If we make this equation, we have, it is true, a transposition in vv. 46, 47 of the love towards enemies and prayer for persecutors of v. 44. But this is not important, because the ideas of love and prayer include and do not exclude each other. The conclusion to which we are led is that to the Jewish disciple of the day the words 'love your enemies and pray for your persecutors,' whatever else they meant, were intended to mean 'you must love and you must pray for both the Gentile and the tax-gatherer.'

This form of the new law of love at once suggests an illuminating interpretation of our text, 'Let him be unto thee as the Gentile and the tax-gatherer.' The whole passage (18¹⁵⁻¹⁷) therefore means that, if all other legitimate methods fail, if your Christian brother will attend neither to your own remonstrance, nor to that of friends, nor to the authority of the Church, your only resource is—not to spurn him, break off intercourse or treat him as an enemy is usually treated, but to treat him and regard him as some one to be made the special object of love and prayer, just as the Master bade you love and pray for the Gentile and the tax-gatherer. This interpretation not only furnishes a parallel to Mt 5⁴³⁻⁴⁸, but well expresses the spirit of our Lord's teaching and example—a condition which the usual interpretations (as to breaking off intercourse, etc.) do not. Jesus came to teach us, among much else, that when all other legitimate methods of dealing with wrongdoing fail, there always remain for us the 'last weapon' of love towards and prayer for the offender.

STEPHEN HOBHOUSE.

Broxbourne, Herts.

The Translation of 2 Timothy ii. 26.

καὶ ἀνανήψωσιν ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου παγίδος
ἐζωργημένοι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα.

THE publication of Professor E. F. Scott's admirable commentary on the Pastoral Epistles is an incentive to the re-examination of certain passages which have been variously understood by translators and exegetes down the centuries to the present time. This passage is a notorious *crux interpretum*. Greek fathers, scholars of the Reformation period, expositors of our own time, differ in their understanding of the text.

Dr. Scott is commenting on Dr. Moffatt's translation. Here the commentator differs from the translator. Both differ from Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Latin Vulgate, and the Syriac Peshitto, with which Luther, Tyndale, the Great Bible, and the Authorized Version broadly agree. Of the three English versions the Great Bible seems the most accurate in rendering ἐζωργημένοι, 'holden captive,' with Theodore and the Vulgate. Theophylact does not distinguish between ἐζωργημένοι and ζωργηθέντες, and, moreover, he takes the clause as referring to the action and will of God. If the characteristic meaning of the perfect participle is attended to, it is more natural to understand the clause as explanatory of the devil's snare. 'The most natural sense might seem to be that they escape the devil's snare after he has entrapped them and forced them to do his will.' So Dr. Scott affirms, and rightly affirms. It is the most natural sense: but why not the correct sense? Dr. Scott finds an objection in the two different Greek pronouns αὐτοῦ and ἐκείνου, regarding which he says, 'By his employment of these two terms the writer seems purposely to distinguish two agents—the devil and God.' Is it really so? There are clear instances of ἐκείνου quickly following αὐτοῦ and yet referring to the same person, e.g. Plato, *Phaedo* 106 B, and *Protagoras* 310 D (see Parry, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 61). It is an idiom of older Greek, which has disappeared from Modern Greek. In Mt 26²⁴, καλὸν ἦν αὐτῷ εἰ οὐκ ἐγεννήθη ὁ ἄνθρωπος ἐκείνος is thus translated (B. and F. Bible Society text), καλὸν ἦτο εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκείνον ἃν δὲν ᾔθελε γεννηθῆ. Whereas in the older Greek the less emphatic term precedes the more emphatic, in the modern language the sequence is reversed, and αὐτός as subject is omitted. It is both natural and idiomatic to take αὐτοῦ and ἐκείνου here as referring to the same person.

Dr. Moffatt, following the Theophylact tradition, refers both pronouns to God. He attributes a rare meaning (found in Homer) to ἐζωργημένοι, 'brought back to life.' Apart from the rarity of this meaning, it is not easy to think of the writer so employing it after using the word παγίδος, which is naturally followed by ζωρεῖν in its ordinary sense of 'capture alive.'

If naturalness is a sound criterion of correctness, Dr. Scott would seem to offend against it by breaking the natural flow of the language with a halt after αὐτοῦ, Dr. Moffatt by neglecting the relation between παγίδος and ἐζωργημένοι. Then, again, εἰς τὸ ἐκείνου θέλημα is not naturally linked with ἀνανήψωσιν, which needs no such completion and is better without it. Doubtless the phrase 'will of God' is more in line with Biblical usage. But the 'snare of the devil' prepares the reader for the 'will of the devil,' inasmuch as 'snare' implies the operation of 'will.' Furthermore, the introduction of the 'snare' metaphor calls for explication, which is quite fittingly given by the ἐζωργημένοι clause, as understood by the translators of the Authorized Version.

Here the Revisers of 1881 have followed another interpretation, possible but surely improbable, which refers αὐτοῦ to the Lord's servant of v. 24 and ἐκείνου to God. It is not surprising that some of them dissented from this view and secured the insertion of an alternative in the margin. The reference of αὐτοῦ to so distant a subject can hardly be accepted, though apparently commended to Bengel and others by suiting that interpretation of ἐζωργημένοι, which links it with Lk 5¹⁰, ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν ἀνθρώπους ἔσθι ζωγρῶν. In the Septuagint ζωρεῖν is variously applied. In Jos 2¹³ 6²⁵ it is applied to the preservation of Rahab and her household when other inhabitants of Jericho are destroyed; but in 2 Ch 25¹² it is applied to the capture of prisoners who are straightway consigned to utter destruction. The common element is the taking alive, which may have a sinister purpose as well as a merciful one.

Interpreters may feel that the reference of ἐκείνου to God gives a happier end to a very impressive sentence packed with the finest Christian teaching. True: but the homilist is anxious to warn his readers of the formidable character of the opposition which confronts the Lord's servant in his labours for the furtherance of righteousness and truth.

I should like to add a translation (my own) of the whole sentence (2 Ti 2²⁴⁻²⁶):

'The Lord's servant must not fight, but be peaceable towards all men, apt to teach, patient of evil, gently schooling the adversely disposed; lest at any time God may grant them a change of mind to recognize what is

true, and they may recover themselves out of the devil's snare—held captive by him, as they are, a living prey to *his* (sinister) will.'

JAMES P. WILSON.

St. Quivox, Ayr.

Entre Nous.

The Life to Come.

It is one thing to believe in the life to come, another to form some conception of it. Our conception of it will depend very largely on our views of the relation of soul and body.

According to the Greek tradition, in its most typical form, the soul is an everlasting thing. It does not perish with the dissolution of its earthly tabernacle. Already, indeed, before its entrance into the body it possessed the quality of everlastingness. Here it tabernacles for a season, leading a dull prison-house kind of existence. But at death it escapes from the prison-house, and emerges once more upon the broad and glorious expanses of eternity. The body returns to the earth from which it came, and the soul or spirit is united once again to the Infinite and Eternal Substance of God.

Through Wordsworth's famous Ode, English readers have been made familiar with this notion of the everlasting nature of the soul, never born and never dying. He perpetuates for us the old Greek conception, which is also the Oriental conception, in poetic and transfigured form. Under the influence of Plato's doctrine of the soul as an eternal and indestructible thing, and more especially of his doctrine of reminiscence or recollection, he represents the soul at birth, which he describes as but a sleep and a forgetting, as coming fresh from God's imperial palace; so that the child is nearer than the man to the vision splendid. And it is apparently implied that after death the soul must reach again its home in God, beyond that immortal sea which brought us hither, where the mighty waters roll for evermore.

So far the old Greek and Oriental conception of the soul and its relation to the body. At the present day it is chiefly expounded in Hindu philosophy and among Western theosophers.

Turn now to the Christian tradition. In the Christian tradition the notion of the soul's pre-

existence is virtually ignored, most people in the Western world regarding it as merely a haunting speculation. Christian thought rejects also the Greek and Oriental view of the future state, in which the soul, being part of the Divine Essence or Substance, is at death merged again in the Infinite, as the stream loses itself in the ocean. Such a view is regarded as subversive of the feeling and consciousness of moral responsibility: if there is no personal survival in the world to come, then it is difficult to think of this world as in any real sense a sphere of moral discipline and preparation.

What, then, does Christianity affirm as over against the Greek view? In the Christian tradition the effort is made to conserve the idea of personal survival. According to the Hebrew doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh, soul and body though dissolved at death shall yet meet again, and thus the complete or entire person be reconstituted.

But the doctrine of the resurrection of the flesh, of the reassembling of the material particles of the body, presents difficulties of its own. St. Paul did not accept it, at every stage of his thought at least, and it was in view of St. Paul's teaching that in the English Prayer Book version of the Apostles' Creed the phrase, 'I believe . . . in the resurrection of the flesh,' was changed into the less materialistic phrase, 'I believe . . . in the resurrection of the body.' The notion that the soul and the body of flesh shall meet again must always have been a difficult notion for thoughtful people to maintain, and the advance of physical and chemical science has made it now almost unbelievable.

How does St. Paul conceive of the state of personal existence in the hereafter? In 1 Co 15 he draws a distinction between the natural body and the spiritual body, and affirms that in the resurrection of the dead it is not the natural but a spiritual body that is raised: 'It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body.'

In 2 Co 5 he appears to reaffirm this distinction

in a more figurative way. Here on earth, as he says in effect, we dwell in a tabernacle, a tent, a building made of perishable stuff, liable to collapse at any moment; there in heaven we shall dwell in a building of God, immaterial, spiritual, eternal—in a glorious body, a spiritual not a natural body; fashioned by the Divine Artificer—as we might add—to be the organ or instrument of the Christlike soul. 'We know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.'

WILLIAM FULTON.

Glasgow.

Christianity and the Individual.

Professor Halford E. Luccock of Yale University has chosen a vital subject for his latest book, *Christianity and the Individual* (Hodder & Stoughton; 5s. net). Those who know Professor Luccock's previous books, and who look for fresh ideas put in a way essentially easy to follow, and lit up by the many illustrations with which his mind is stored, will find here all they expect.

Professor Luccock considers the forces which are running over the individual 'like a fleet of steam rollers,' crushing out personal values. And these are not only found in Totalitarian States. In democracies, economic forces, the tyranny of mass thinking, and other movements overrun personality. And so his object is to rethink the place of the individual—to consider what is the Christian contribution to the achievement of personality; in brief, what is the individual gospel. In considering this, Professor Luccock does not forget the Social Gospel.

This is a book for preachers, and while all is good, we have no hesitation in saying that the best is the last chapter, where Professor Luccock writes on preaching to personal needs. For he agrees with Dr. Coffin that preaching is 'truth through personality to a person.' Preaching is not broadcasting to the universe, but 'must be aimed at a definite receiving end' and the preacher must bring ideals into moving relationship with the machinery of everyday living. Here he uses the symbol of William James, 'The upper mill wheel above a lower one may be turning, but unless there is some sort of a peg joining the lower one to the upper, the motion of the upper wheel will not turn the lower one. The upper wheel may represent ideals, faiths, professions; the lower one, the practices of everyday life. Often there is little or no connexion between the two. There is need to drop down a peg from the upper to the lower wheel so that faiths and ideals may be brought

into effective relation to the machinery of everyday experience. Preaching has much to do with "pegs."'

But he enters a caveat against 'practical' preaching, and reminds his readers of the passage in Canon C. E. Raven's autobiography in which he tells of his disappointment in schoolboy days over the preaching which left out any deeply religious challenge.

'One of the highest offices of friendship is expectation, the demand of faith and love, which holds a friend up to his utmost. Jesus never failed men in that high gift of friendship. The friendliest word He ever spoke was, "Take up your cross and follow me." It was a persistent friendship for the highest possibility in men.'

Preachers must disturb, or they will merit the words of Joseph Auslander:

We who were prophets and priest-men
For the Kings of the East and the East-men,
The bugles of God to the beast-men,
His terrible seal on our brow—
Physicians of music and makers
Of language and law and the breakers
Of battle, strength-lifters, heart-shakers—
We are nice poets now.

'Ye have heard it said.'

'Henri Bergson, in his *Two Sources of Morality and Religion*, whatever his book may lack as a completely satisfactory ethics or philosophy of religion, has put preachers deeply in his debt in his suggestive distinction between the morality of "obligation" and that of "aspiration." By the "morality of obligation" he means those moralities of customs and habits which are useful instruments for social cohesion for the family, the tribe, and the nation. It is a type of morality necessary if societies are to be kept stable and fixed. So much of the stress of organized religion has gone into the teaching of this kind of morality, often to being blind to any other variety. There is also, Bergson says, a morality which springs from intelligence as opposed to bundles of habit, a morality tinged often with scepticism toward much traditional moral "obligation." It is the morality which is not forced by obligation, but in which the vision of some ideal incarnate in some saint or moral hero "beckons the individual to some vital variation," some new expression of moral feeling. It will be readily seen that it is in this second type of morality that there is the largest and indeed the only hope for a Christian world. It is the kind of morality which lies close to

the heart of Christian teaching, as put in Jesus' contrasts, "Ye have heard it said, . . . but I say unto you."¹

Truth.

Mr. Arnold Lunn contributes an article to the September number of *The Nineteenth Century*, in which he urges the eradicating of the 'greatest of all heresies,' "It does not matter what a man believes so long as he behaves."

'We have not repudiated Christianity in England,' he writes, 'but we treat it as irrelevant and unimportant. English education is based on the implicit premise that it is more important for a boy to know when Queen Anne died than for him to discover why Christ rose from the dead. We have accepted with uncritical faith the greatest of heresies, that it does not matter what a man believes so long as he behaves, and we are unmoved by the evidence which suggests that men cease to behave when they cease to believe. We are losing our respect for truth, but we forget that truth has its claims apart from the social consequences of truth. The events of the first Easter Sunday belong to history, and if it be important to know what happened at Waterloo, it is equally important to know what happened in a garden near Jerusalem on the first Easter Sunday, even if the social and ethical consequences of that happening were of no importance.'

'Christianity is something more than a useful adjunct to "house spirit." A young friend of mine summed up his experience of public school religion. "At Eton," he said, "they told me that Christianity would help me to be good. I did not particularly want to be good, so I was not interested in Christianity. Some years later I discovered that Christianity was true, and from the fact of its truth certain inconvenient conclusions followed, among others that I ought to try to be good."'

Beauty.

'Walking, two mornings since,' writes Robert Nichols in *Time and Tide*, 'along a narrow damp alley, I looked up and saw some five or six sprays of a creeper with orange-red flowers silhouetted against the pure blue of the sky. "For those six sprays," I said to myself, "I would surrender man-made Venice entire." Pondering this discovery, I ask myself why man-made Venice should move me so little and those few hundred tiny leaves and twenty-one flowers so much. My answer is lame enough but, such as it is, I believe it to be made without self-deceit. "I feel as I do because there

is a blessing in these flowers which either never was in these buildings or has departed from them." I do not quite know what I mean by blessing, but I know that life for me is becoming more and more impossible without the sense of it. To what this sense of blessing in these flowers is due, I cannot exactly say, but I fancy it has to do with an immediate perception that these flowers are the work of an artist of extraordinary spontaneity and apparently effortless and quite illimitable power.'

The Little Region of Palestine.

At the British Association meetings at Nottingham last month, Mr. H. G. Wells was president of the educational science section, and he had a number of provocative and thoroughly Wellsian things to say, especially on the teaching of history. 'And I have to suggest another exclusion. We are telling our young people about the real past, the majestic expansion of terrestrial events. In these events the little region of Palestine is no more than a part of the highway between Egypt and Mesopotamia. Is there any real reason nowadays for exaggerating its importance in the past? Nothing began there, nothing was worked out there. All the historical part of the Bible abounds in wild exaggeration of the importance of this little strip of land.'

'Is it not time that we recognized the extreme insignificance of the events recorded in Kings and Chronicles, and ceased to throw the historical imagination of our young people out of perspective by an over-emphasized magnification of the history of Judea? Look at our time-table and what we have to teach. If we give history four-tenths of all the time we have for imparting knowledge, that still gives us at most something a little short of four hundred hours altogether. Even if we think it desirable to perplex another generation with the myths of the Creation, the Flood, the Chosen People, and so forth, we haven't got the time for it—any more than we have the time for the really quite unedifying records of all the Kings and Queens of England and their claims on this and that. No reason why much of that stuff should not be picked up in private reading—by those who like that sort of thing.'

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

¹ H. E. Luccock, *Christianity and the Individual*, 197.